S2290-1

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

1982 and 1983

Written and Edited by Dana Howard
Proofreading and Typing by Marjorie Maxwell
Rate comparisons compiled by the IPUC Accounting and Finance Division

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
472 WEST WASHINGTON STREET
BOISE, IDAHO 83720

MAILING ADDRESS:
STATEHOUSE
BOISE, IDAHO 83720

General Number	334-3143
Commission Secretary	334-3172
Public Information	334-3415
Consumer Assistance	334-3143
Dir. Accounting & Finance Division	334-3466
Dir. Rates & Engineering Division	334-3768
Dir. Legal Division	334-2442
Dir. Regulated Carrier Divison	334-3092
Dir. Consumer Services Division	334-3105

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Overview of IPUC	3
Commissioners	5
Organization of IPUC & Staff	7-8
Financial Summary	9
Idaho Power Co.	11-15
Washington Water Power Co.	17-20
Utah Power and Light Co.	21-24
Citizens Utilities Co.	25-26
Pacific Power & Light Co.	27-29
Inverted Rates	31
Cogeneration	33-37
Swan Falls Water Right Issue	39-40
Intermountain Gas Co.	41-43
Telecommunications Overview	45-46
Idaho Mountain Bell	47-51
General Telephone Co. of the NW	53-55
Continental Telephone Co. of the West	57-58
Other Telephone Companies	59-60
Intrastate Access Charge Proposal	61
Water Companies	63
Regulated Carrier	65-69
Listing of Idaho Utilities	71-82
APPENDIX: Comparison of Residential Electric & Gas Rates within the State of Idaho	

INTRODUCTION

In 1982 and 1983, the Idaho Public Utilities Commission faced some of the most complex and difficult decisions in its history.

In the electric utility arena, the forecasting of new power needs became even more important and sensitive. New thermal additions to Idaho's largely inexpensive hydroelectric system meant that most new projects would significantly raise power prices. But at the same time, the Commission was dealing with the effects of slowed growth, which made predicting the need for new power more difficult than ever before.

Many of the Commission's efforts during this time were also aimed at protecting Idaho ratepayers during the federal effort to deregulate the telephone industry and during the massive AT&T divestiture.

Rate cases became more technical during this period. Computer modeling was brought into the picture. Paperwork for a rate case that once required only a small file began to take up two file cabinet drawers.

With a total staff of approximately 55, the Commission in Fiscal Year 1983 handled 118 formal utility cases - 33 of them requests for rate increases. In addition, the Regulated Carrier Division during the same time handled 417 cases involving rates, motor carrier authority and railroads.

The Commission continued its policy of holding public hearings in the communities served by the utility seeking the rate increase or policy change. For this reason, the three commissioners and the IPUC staffers spent much of their time on the road, holding hearings everywhere from the Mullan Elementary School Cafeteria, to the Homedale High gymnasium, to convention centers and universities throughout the state. Hearing examiners were used very infrequently.

Another priority of the Commission was to keep the public informed of as many utility and transportation issues, hearings and decisions as possible - in the clearest possible language. During Fiscal Year 1983, the IPUC issued 152 news releases and delivered countless other notifications to cities, chambers, and community organizations.

OVERVIEW

The Public Utilities Commission of Idaho was established by the 12th Session of the Idaho Legislature and was organized May 8, 1913. In 1951, the Commission was reorganized and its name was changed to the Idaho Public Utilities Commission. The primary responsibility of the IPUC, as outlined by the Idaho Code, is to set just and reasonable utility rates and insure adequate services, while at the same time giving the regulated utility companies an opportunity to earn a fair rate of return.

By law, the Commission regulates investor-owned utilities and the intrastate operations of the transportation industry. The Commission's jurisdiction includes five electric utilities, 19 telephone companies, two natural gas companies, 24 water companies, six railroads, about 500 intrastate common carriers and thousands of interstate and private motor carriers.

The IPUC is unique among Idaho's state government agencies. As an independent regulatory body created by the Legislature, the Commission has quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and quasi-enforcement powers. For example, in its quasi-legislative capacity, the Commission sets the rules governing utility operations. The IPUC under its quasi-judicial powers must decide contested issues, such as whether a rate increase is justified. And the Commission must enforce state law affecting utilities and motor carriers.

The three members of the IPUC are appointed by the Governor and are confirmed by the Idaho Senate. They serve staggered six-year terms. If a vacancy occurs when the Senate is not in session, the Governor may appint a replacement subject to later Senate approval. No more than two of the commissioners may be of the same political party.

To help insure that Commission decisions are fair and workable, it maintains a staff of engineers, rate analysts, attorneys, accountants, investigators, economists and other support personnel. The staff carefully analyses each rate increase request, each application for an operating certificate and each complaint. The staff presents recommendations on these and other matters to the Commission. The IPUC considers staff recommendations along with others it receives from participating industry, agricultural, business and consumer groups, from the public and from the utilities it regulates.

The IPUC regularly conducts hearings on utility and transportation issues, usually in the service area of the utility it is considering to allow for maximum public participation. The hearings are always open to the public.

THE COMMISSIONERS

Conley Ward, Jr was appointed to the IPUC in April 1977 by Gov. John V. Evans, and for a second term in April 1983. He served as Commission President from February 1979 to November 1980 and began his second term as President in April 1983. He is an attorney holding a J.D. degree from the University of Colorado School of Law and a B.A. degree from Columbia University. He was a Deputy Attorney General at the IPUC and was in private practice prior to his appointment to the Commission. Ward is a Democrat whose term expires in 1989.

Perry Swisher was appointed to the Commission in March 1979 by Gov. Evans and served as Commission President from November 1980 to April 1983. He served as an Idaho legislator for several terms in addition to his many years in the newspaper business and private enterprise. Swisher was Chairman of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Taxation in 1977-78. He sits on the Idaho Advisory Council to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. He is a Democrat whose term expires in 1985.

Richard S. High was appointed to the Commission by Gov. Evans in March 1981. He served for 14 years in the Idaho Senate, chairing the Senate Finance Committee for 10 years and the Senate Judiciary Committee for two years. High is an engineer with 27 years of farm development and management experience. He is a Republican whose term expires in 1987.

ORGANIZATION OF THE IPUC AND ITS STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

The Administrative Division is responsible for coordinating overall IPUC activities. The division includes the three commissioners, the Commission Secretary, the Director of Policy and Administration, the Executive Assistant, the Fiscal Officer, Personnel Officer, Chief Information Officer and clerical support staff.

The Commission Secretary, a post established by Idaho statute, keeps a precise public record of all Commission proceedings and meetings. The Secretary also issues notices, orders and other documents to the proper parties.

The Director of Policy and Administration oversees the entire workload of the IPUC and coordinates the activities of the various divisions. The Executive Assistant is primarily responsible for the fiscal operations of the Commission. The Fiscal Office oversees the budget, payroll, purchase and maintenance of materials and equipment, and personnel matters. The Public Information Officer is responsible for informing the public of Commission decisions, meetings and activities, responding to requests for information,, coordinating public hearings and preparing materials that allow for effective public participation in IPUC proceedings.

LEGAL DIVISION

The IPUC staff is represented by five Deputy Attorneys General, who are hired by the Commission and have permanent offices at IPUC headquarters.

The IPUC staff attorneys represent the staff in all matters before the Commission, working closely with staff accountants, engineers and economists as they develop their recommedations for rate case and policy proceedings. Attorneys represent the staff in the hearing room and cross-examine other parties who submit testimony.

RATES AND ENGINEERING DIVISION

The Rates and Engineering Division is responsible for the economic and engineering analysis of utility rates and practices. This division may analyze, for example, the cost of providing a particiular type of service and the fairness of its price. Economists may review the method the utilities use to forecast the need for new plants or the way a utility divides

responsibility for costs among the several states it may serve. Engineers and economists also review the cost-effectiveness of conservation and cogeneration programs.

ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE DIVISION

The Accounting and Finance Division is responsible for auditing all utilities to determine their proper income and expenses. When utilities request rate increases, for example, IPUC staff auditors conduct detailed analyses of the companies' revenues, their expenditures, their accounting methods and the cost of their capital. From these studies, staff accountants are able to recommend how much revenue from rates the companies require to earn whatever return the Commission allows.

CONSUMER SERVICES DIVISION

The Consumer Services Division has two functions. First, its staffers are responsible for handling all complaints from customers of the utilities. Complaint investigators may, for instance, mediate billing disputes between the company and a customer. They also help others get in touch with organizations that may have funding for customers in financial difficulty. Secondly, the division closely monitors the quality of customer service at each regulated utility; if it finds, for instance, that poor customer service merits the Commission's attention, it may submit testimony recommending IPUC action. Consumer Services also may recommend rate plans and utility customer policies to the Commission.

REGULATED CARRIER DIVISION

The Regulated Carrier Division is responsible for regulating private, common and contract intrastate motor carriers, and all interstate motor carriers. The division makes sure motor carriers are adequately insured and comply with all safety requirements.

In addition, the IPUC has jurisdiction over railroad station agencies, bus routes and fares.

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Financial Summary
FY-83

July 1, 1982 - June 30, 1983

Appropriation (Dedicated Fund)	$2,544,000
Appropriation (General Fund)	134,500
TOTAL APPROPRIATION	$2,678,500
Receipts:	
Collected from Utilities	$2,100,340
Other Misc. Receipts	20,213
Motor Carrier Fees	419,018
Railroad Fees	223,762
General Fund	134,500
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$2,897,833
Expenditures:	
Salaries & Fringe Benefits	$1,337,547
Salaries & Fringe Benefits (General Fund)	129,648
Travel	80,445
Professional Services	237,408
Other Services (Transcripts, Data Processing, etc.)	118,008
Communications (Postage & Telephone)	62,420
Materials and Supplies	20,969
Rentals	159,576
Repairs & Maintenance	12,985
Misc. Expenditures	1,800
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$2,160,806
Capital Outlay	11,143
GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$2,171,949
Unexpended Balance of Receipts Subject to Refund to Utilities	725,884

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

Idaho Power Co. is the state's largest electric utility, serving most of southwestern and southern Idaho. It is based in Boise and has about 240,000 customers.

The IPUC's 1982-83 regulation of Idaho Power Company was highlighted by a $39.3 million, 15.3 percent rate increase and a year-long investigation of its future construction plans and forecasting methods. In addition, the IPUC and Idaho Power Company attempted to settle much of the controversy surrounding rates paid to independent power producers and the Commission's authority over the company's cogeneration program.

One of the most significant developments during this period was the IPUC staff's growing expertise in the analysis of Idaho Power's computer modeling, which the company uses extensively to justify rate increase requests. Hydroelectric utilities, such as Idaho Power, are subject to dramatically fluctuating revenues and costs because they depend upon variable streamflows and weather. Computer models figure the company's "normalized" operations, and thus its average need for revenue. The company's modelling techniques were analyzed and challenged for the first time.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, residential bills for 500 kilowatt hours/mo. increased from $11.57 to $19.90, for 1,000 kwh/mo. from $25.45 to $39.30, and for all-electric customers using an annual average of 2,000 kwh/mo. from $61.50 to $79.60. Part of the increase was attributable to the shrinking credit the Bonneville Power Administration had been offering residential and irrigation customers since December 1981. Idaho Power customers no longer qualified for the credit after September 1983.

IDAHO POWER CO.
RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1006-185
December 1981-August 1982

Company Application:

On December 20, 1981, Idaho Power Company applied for a $72 million, 28.6% annual revenue increase - $29.6 million of which the utility said was directly attributable to the then just-completed 250 megawatt Valmy I coal-fired plant in northern Nevada. Under the company's proposal, residential rates would have increased an average 24%, from $38.64 for 1,250 kilowatt hours to about $48.

Rates for the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory would have increased 24%, 51% for the FMC Corp., 33% for the Monsanto Co. and 30% for the Simplot Co.

Idaho Power requested an increase in its return on common equity from 14.75 to 17% that, together with recognition of change in its cost of debt and preferred stock dividends, would have produced an increase in its authorized overall return from 11.188% to 12.477%.

In February 1982, the Commission granted Idaho Power an interim $24 million, 9.5% uniform rate increase to cover the immediate costs of the Valmy I plant, of which Idaho Power owns a 50%, 125 mw share.

In August 1982, the Commission concluded the case by awarding the company an additional $15 million, 5.25% increase over the interim, bringing the 1982 rate boost to a total $39.3 million, 15.3%.

The Commission ruled in a subsequent February 1982 revenue allocation order that the final residential rate increase would be an average 18.7%; small and large general service, 10%; irrigation pumping, 15.9%; FMC Corp., 25%; Monsanto Co., 17.4%; Simplot, 15.3%; and the INEL, 10%.

The company was allowed to increase its authorized overall return from 11.188% to 11.671%, but the commissioners disagreed on the return on common equity. Commissioner Swisher recommended a 15.73% common equity return based on the company's existing capital structure; Commissioner Ward, a 15.42% return based on the capital structure the company would have after a planned stock issuance; and Commissioner High, a 15% return based on an ideal capital structure.

Other items in the Commission's 55-page order included:

- The acceptance of IPUC staff economist's argument that computer models Idaho Power uses to calculate costs and sales from its power plants overstated the company's need for revenue. The Commission ordered Idaho Power to calculate its need for ratepayer revenue with the assumption that it can rely more heavily on power purchases outside of its own system, when economical.

- A finding that Idaho Power acted reasonably when it decided in 1976 to continue a take-or-pay contract for 800,000 tons per year of coal from the Black Butte coal company. Idaho Power now has no need for the coal and is paying for coal it does not take, but the Commission said the company had reason to believe in 1976, when coal reserves were scarce, that the fuel would be needed. The Commission allowed these costs, amounting to $2,877,300.

- A decision that Idaho Power may no longer charge ratepayers $633,000 in capital costs on $2.3 million in payments for a boiler Idaho Power had ordered in the mid-1970's for the proposed Pioneer plant. The boiler was later installed at the Boardman, Ore. plant after the IPUC turned down Idaho Power's request to build Pioneer. But the boiler was more expensive than others available at the time. The IPUC said ratepayers should not pay for the boiler's extra cost because Idaho Power purchased the boiler before it had secured permission to build Pioneer.

Public hearings on the request were held at Boise in January, March, May, July and October 1982. It was the most complex and technical case in the IPUC's history of Idaho Power Co. regulation.

Fact-Finding Case No. U-1006-197

Saying Idaho Power's ratepayers should know in advance the impact of the utility's then-planned $1 billion-plus five-year construction plan, the IPUC in July 1982 announced it would conduct a fact-finding investigation into the company's future construction program.

The IPUC said it wanted to learn what projects the company intended to pursue through the end of the century, how it was formulating its power demand forecasts to justify the projects, how the projects would be financed, and how its obligation to purchase independently-produced power fit into its program.

Among the record number of 13 intervenors was a prominent Idaho Power stockholder who joined with three outside directors of the company to formally participate in the case. The stockholder, William Norgren of Rancho Santa Fe, Calif., had challenged in early 1982 the IPUC's go-ahead on an Idaho Power stock issuance. The investor said the stock issuance was typical of the kinds of below-book value stock sales one could expect from the company's five-year construction plan. He said additional stock issuances would further dilute the value of his stock.

When Idaho Power subsequently applied for revised cogeneration rates in October 1982, the IPUC decided to hold those hearings in conjunction with the -197 hearings, though the cases remained formally separate proceedings.

When the case was decided one year later in July 1983, the Commission ruled that although it will begin closely monitoring Idaho Power's plant construction costs, the utility had, in general, prudently managed its system.

Since the case had begun, however, Idaho Power had scaled-down its projected annual power demand growth rates from 2.7% to an

average annual 1.9% through the year 2002. In its amended five-year construction program, published October 1982, it also halved its construction program. The company now only expects to pursue through 1982 the completion of its 125 mw share in Valmy II, the completion of its 12.8 mw Cascade Dam, and an upgrade of its 11.2 mw Swan Falls Dam to 25 mw. It also said it expected to purchase a total 135 mw of power from cogeneration and other independent power projects by 1992.

In its final order, the Commission said:

-Idaho Power would no longer receive Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct new power facilities when only initial construction cost estimates are available.

-Idaho Power now will be required to fully document and explain all construction plant items which increase in cost from original estimates.

-IPCo will have to reevaluate its median-year water planning and formally study its transmission line intertie system for adequacy in low water years.

-IPCo was praised for its cost-effective conservation programs.

BPA Exchange Credits End

The value of the Bonneville Power Administration exchange credits dropped to zero in September 1983. The BPA had been offering the credits to Idaho Power's residential and irrigation customers since December 1981, but they were due to end, at least temporarily, when BPA's average system cost increased in November 1983. The program was halted more than a month earlier, however, after IPCo and BPA disagreed over the formula used to calculate the credits, and IPCo did not have the funds on hand to award the September/October credits. The credits, just before they ended, were lowering residential power bills by 12.8%, or by .452 cents/kwh, dropping Idaho Power's residential rate of 3.98 cents/kwh to 3.53 cents/kwh.

Energy Conservation Programs

Low wattage commercial lighting: The IPUC authorized in May 1982 a $270,000 program that would give Idaho Power commercial and industrial customers a 65 cent credit for each qualifying low-wattage fluorescent lamp installed to replace existing conventional lamps.

Energy-saving irrigation sprinklers: The IPUC authorized in December 1982 a program aimed at encouraging irrigation equipment dealers to sell energy-saving low-pressure irrigation

sprinkler heads. Idaho Power was authorized to give dealers $2 for each low-pressure nozzle sold. The demonstration project was limited to the first 25,000 nozzles.

70% cash grant residential weatherization: The IPUC authorized in February 1983 a 70% cash grant program for Idaho Power customers weatherizing their electrically-heated homes. Under the plan, Idaho Power makes outright cash payments worth up to 70% of the qualifying measures' price. The homeowner must pay upfront 30% of the cost of the project. The new program replaced the company's zero-interest program; Idaho Power said cash grants are usually less expensive than carrying the interest charges on the no-interest loans.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

Regulation of the Washington Water Power Co. in 1982 and 1983 was dominated by the approaching completion of several new thermal plants and concern over a major increase in the utility's traditionally low hydroelectric power prices.

The Spokane, Washington-based utility, which serves 56,000 customers in northern Idaho, decided in the late 1970s and early 1980s to participate in several thermal power plants: the Colstrip No. 3 and 4 coal plants in Montana, the Washington Public Power Supply System No. 3 nuclear plant, the Skagit/Hanford nuclear plant and the proposed Creston coal plant. In addition, WWP decided in 1980 to build its own 42.5 megawatt Kettle Falls wood-waste plant in eastern Washington; the plant was on-line in October 1983, although it was shut down in December 1983 after experiencing difficulties with its air pollution control equipment.

Throughout the early 1980s, the company sought Construction Work in Progress funding (CWIP) on its Colstrip No. 3 plant; it was in almost all cases denied.

In 1983, the company applied for an unprecedented 68.4 %, $33.8 million rate increase to allow it to begin earning on its nearly completed Colstrip No. 3 and Kettle Falls plants.

Meanwhile, WWP experienced record-high streamflows and a drop in the demand for its energy, due to residential and commercial conservation and the 1982 closure of the Bunker Hill silver mine in northern Idaho.

Although major rate increases loomed on the horizon, between January 1982 and December 1983, residential rates increased only moderately and did not rise above 2.67 cents per kwh, even for average all-electric customers on an inverted rate plan. WWP rates remained the lowest of all privately-owned electric utilities in the U.S.

During this two-year period, customers using 500 kwh/mo. (typical for lights and appliances only) saw their average monthly bills rise from $9 to $10.38. Customers using 1,000 kwh/mo. (for lights, appliances and water heating) saw their monthly bills rise on an average from $20.35 to $23.14. All-electric customers saw their average monthly bills rise from $48.45 to $53.39.

The IPUC handled two major WWP rate cases during this period. The IPUC staff applied its growing expertise in computer modeling to challenge company rate increase proposals.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER
RATE CASES

CASE NO. U-1008-170/171
March 1982-September 1982

Company Application:

In March 1982, WWP applied for a $14.9 million, 29% electric rate increase. Most of the increase was directly related to the company's request for Construction Work in Progress funding for its Colstrip No. 3 plant in Montana. WWP has a 15%, or 105 mw share in the 700 mw plant.

Under the company proposal, residential rates would have increased an average 31%, from $30.13 for 1,300 kwh to about $39.65. Rates for commerical customers would have increased an average 24% and industrial customers an average 30.6%.

The company also asked for a $2.1 million, 5.7% increase in its annual natural gas revenues. Under the company's proposal, residential gas rates would have risen an average 7.6%, from $56.20 for 100 therms to $60.50. The proposal would have increased commercial gas rates by 6.6% and firm industrial rates by 4.7%.

WWP requested an increase in its authorized return on common equity from 15.25% to 17.5% (or to 16.25% if the company's attrition adjustment were approved) that would have boosted its overall return from 11.74% to 13.08%.

Public hearings were held on the company's case May 18-20 at Coeur d'Alene and on the staff/intervenor case June 16-17 at the same location. A final hearing for additional testimony was held July 16 at Lewiston. Formal intervenors were Potlatch Corp., Hecla Mining Corp. and Sunshine Mining Co.

Granted by the Commission:

In September 1982, the Commission granted WWP a $521,000, 1% increase in its electric rates and a $1.7 million, 4.57% increase in its gas rates.

A WWP residential customer using 1,300 kwh per month saw an increase of 42 cents per month as a result of the order, from $30.15 to $30.55 per month. But an Oct. 1 end to the exchange credit program offered by the Bonneville Power Administration added another $2.12 to the same bill.

The company was denied CWIP on Colstrip No. 3 and was denied the substantial attrition adjustment it had proposed. Its return on common equity was left at 15.25%.

WWP subsequently petitioned the IPUC for a rehearing, which it was granted on the issue of attrition alone. It finally was granted an additional .3%, $164,000 increase in electric rates and an extra .07% increase in its gas rates to cover miscellaneous operation expense increases the utility had during the course of the rate case.

CASE NO. U-1008-185
April 1983-

Company Application:

In April 1983, WWP applied for a $33.8 million, 64.8% electric rate increase. Approximately $20 million of the request was related to its share in the Colstrip No. 3 plant, which was scheduled for completion in January 1983. Another $10 million of the request was related to the Kettle Falls wood-waste plant, which was scheduled to be completed in October 1983.

Under the company's proposal, residential rates would have increased by $23.57 per month for a customer using an average 1,300 kwh per month, from $31.16 to $54.73. (Part of the increase would have been due to the effect of a cogeneration agreement it expected to sign with the Potlatch Corp., which would have raised its costs by some 6-7%.) General service rates were proposed to increase by 58.9%, large general service by 59%, extra large general service by 76.3%, pumping by 79.7% and street lighting by 35.7%.

WWP asked for an increase in its authorized return on common equity from 15.25% to 17% that would have increased its overall return from 12.07% to 12.99%.

The IPUC staff and intervenor recommendations criticized the company's decision to build the Kettle Falls plant. Three IPUC staff witnesses and one consumer group - Idaho Fair Share - argued that it was uneconomical to build a plant of that size and cost at that point in the company's construction program.

Four months into the case, the IPUC told WWP it must respond to questions raised by Idaho Fair Share about the $117 million the utility had spent by mid-1983 on its share in the stalled Washington Public Power Supply System No. 3 nuclear plant. The issue was subsequently made into a separate legal proceeding, with hearings scheduled for February 1984.

Public hearings were held at Moscow in August and at Coeur d'Alene in December. The Commission received an unprecedented number of letters, postcards, petitions and public statements opposing the rate increase.

The Commission's decision was expected by Feb. 6, 1984.

OTHER WASHINGTON WATER POWER ISSUES:

Skagit Nuclear Plant: The IPUC in January 1982 informed WWP it could no longer collect interest (for future ratepayer responsibility) on money it spent to conduct preliminary studies on Skagit/Hanford, a stalled nuclear project that was planned for a Hanford, Wash. site. WWP had a share in the plant, which was cancelled in 1983.

Line Extensions: WWP was allowed in March 1982 to require a bigger upfront payment from homeowners and developers needing power line extensions.

Natural Gas Incentives: WWP was authorized in mid-1982 to give $500 cash incentives to new residential customers who hook up to natural gas instead of electricity for home space heating and $200 cash bonuses to customers who replace their electric water heaters with gas water heaters. WWP's plan is to encourage sales off its gas pipeline network, which becomes more cost-effective as it serves increasing numbers of customers. Increased electricity consumption, on the other hand, requires the need for expensive new power plants, which boost rates.

Wholesale Gas Prices: WWP was allowed to pass through two wholesale gas price decreases in 1983, due to a surplus of domestic natural gas.

UTAH POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

Utah Power and Light Co. had only one major rate case before the IPUC during the two years ending December 1983. But while its activities before the Commission had tapered off, the eroding value of the Bonneville Power Administration's energy credit to residential and agricultural customers meant that the price of power to its eastern Idaho customers continued to rise.

The Salt Lake City-based utility serves about 45,000 customers in rural eastern Idaho. It generates most of its power at its own Utah coal-fired plants.

Since late 1981, the BPA has paid to private Northwest electric utility customers the exchange credits promised by the Pacific Northwest Power Planning and Conservation Act. In Idaho, UP&L's customers have received the greatest benefit because their rates have been the highest in the Northwest.. The credit was designed to give customers of the generally higher-priced private utilities the benefit of the cheap hydropower generated at the Northwest's federal dams; the credits increase in value the greater the difference between BPA's power costs and the private utility's.

UP&L customers in Idaho have received the largest energy credits because they have been in proportion to the high rates they pay, relative to the rest of the region. But they also watched them lose value as BPA's power costs skyrocketed in the wake of the failure of the Washington Public Power Supply System's nuclear power plant construction program. The difference between UP&L and BPA power costs began to shrink.

The IPUC granted UP&L only one rate increase during this period: a 15.5% boost in September 1982. But between January 1982 and December 1983, the combination of that increase, along with declining BPA energy credits, resulted in a winter residential bill for 1,000 kwh increasing 37%, from $34.80 to $47.80.

The company opened a new rate case in February 1983 to cover the cost of its nearly-completed Hunter No. 3 coal-fired plant and higher expenses. UP&L abruptly withdrew the application in April 1983. It did not reapply until December 1983.

During the 1982-83 period, UP&L slowed its construction program, deferring the Hunter No. 4 coal-fired plant and reducing its participation in the mammoth Intermountain Power Project from 25% to 4%.

Late in 1983, the three commissioners initiated talks with UP&L, the Wyoming and Utah commissions to study the utility's

allocation of costs and investments among the three states it serves. The Idaho Commission said its wanted to know if strong industrial and oil and gas-related growth in Utah and Wyoming - combined with lowered demand for power from eastern Idaho irrigators - could have changed each state's obligation to UP&L.

UTAH POWER AND LIGHT RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1009-120
March-September 1982

Company Application:

UP&L in March 1982 applied for a $23.8 million, 29.1% annual revenue increase. The company argued that inflation had increased most of its costs, including wages, fuel and property tax expenses. It also said the increase was needed to maintain an adequate interest coverage on its mortgage bonds and to improve dividends on its preferred stock.

Under the company's proposal, residential rates would have increased an average 25% (with the Bonneville Power Administration energy credit taken into account). A residential customer using 1,000 kwh per month in the summer would experience a bill increase from $47.95 to $59.88 under the proposal; the same customer using 2,000 kwh in the winter would see a bill increase from $64.30 to $78.76. (UP&L has seasonal rates and a fluctuating BPA energy credit. The summer month chosen for this example is July 1982; the winter month is November 1982.)

Industrial rates were proposed to increase 25% and irrigation pumping rates by 23% (after the BPA credit).

UP&L requested an increase in its authorized return on common equity from 15.16% to 19.1%, but later stipulated with the IPUC staff to a 15.75% return.

Public hearings were held in June and August 1982 at Pocatello and Idaho Falls. Intervenors were Beker Industries Corp., the Idaho Irrigation Pumpers Association, Monsanto Co., the City of Ammon, FMC Corp., J.R. Simplot Co. and the U.S. Department of Energy.

Granted by the Commission:

In September 1982, the Commission granted UP&L a $12.9 million, 17.5% rate increase.

Residential customers using 1,000 kwh per month (in October 1982, directly after the increase took effect) saw their bills increase from $48.35 to $59.98; customers using 2,000 kwh per month in the winter (November 1982 for this example) saw their bills increase from $64.30 to $82.07.

The IPUC authorized a ceiling 15.25% return on common equity, noting the return was lower than the company-IPUC staff stipulation because the company had slowed its construction program and the overall financial market had improved.

UP&L subsequently petitioned the IPUC for a rehearing, but was turned down. The U.S. Department of Energy also petitioned for a rehearing and was turned down; the DOE had argued that the contracted price its pays UP&L for the availability of power (which it had not recently needed) was too high. The Commission said the DOE must renegotiate with UP&L if it did not like its contract. The DOE subsequently appealed to the Idaho Supreme Court. (The case had not been resolved by the end of 1983.)

CASE NO. U-1009-129
February-April 1983

Company Application:

UP&L applied in February 1983 for an $8 million, 7.5% rate increase.

The proposal would have increased the average residential winter bill by about 1%, (after the BPA energy credit was taken into account) and the average residential summer bill by 6%.

UP&L said it needed the increase to cover increased expenses and the cost of its long-term debt. The company's application noted, for example, a July 1982 sale of $4.6 million in pollution control bonds, an August 1982 sale of $90 million in common stock and a December 1982 sale of $90 million in first mortgage bonds.

It asked for an increase in its return on common equity from 15.25% to 17.3%.

The company in June 1983 withdrew the application, but did not formally state its reasons for doing so. UP&L officials told the IPUC, however, that the June 1983 completion of the new Hunter No. 3 coal plant would have required the company to amend its application anyway. The company said it would apply for another rate case by the end of 1983.

CASE NO. U-1009-137
December 1983-

Company Application:

UP&L applied for a $9.4 million, 9.65% rate increase in December 1983 to track through the cost of its new Hunter No. 3 coal-fired plant and its weatherization program.

Of the total request, $6.9 million was related to the Hunter plant; $2.5 million was related to weatherization loans and grants it made between October 1982 and October 1983.

Under the company's proposal, residential rates would increase overall by 11.23% after the BPA credit.

A residential customer using 1,000 kwh in July would see a bill increase from $56.23 to $63.02 under the proposal; the same customer using 1,000 kwh in January would see a bill increase from $47.84 to $52.90. A bill for 2,000 kwh in January would increase from $95.68 to $105 under the company proposal.

UP&L also asked for Allowance for Funds Used During Construction, or accumulated interest on the Hunter No. 3 plant from the time of the plant's completion in June 1983 to the conclusion of the case.

The first public hearing was scheduled to take place in March 1984.

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

Citizens Utilities Company of Stamford, Connecticut serves about 2,500 electric and water customers in the northern Idaho communities of Wallace, Silverton, Mullan and Burke.

The company purchases all power to serve its Idaho customers from the Washington Water Power Co.

Citizens presented only one major rate case to the IPUC during 1982 and 1983, though it also applied for two "tracker" rate boosts during the same period: revenue to cover increased WWP wholesale power costs approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

The company's 1982 rate increase request faced community opposition of major proportions; it was filed only months after the Bunker Hill Mining Co. shut down its operations and put the area's economy at a standstill.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, the price of 1,000 kwh for a residential customer increased 24%, from $26.33 to $32.76 per month. The price of power for a typical all-electric customer (using 1,000 kwh/mo. for six months of the year and 3,000 kwh/mo. for the other six months) increased 25.6%, from an average $49.86 to $62.66 per month.

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY RATE CASES (ELECTRIC):

CASE NO. U-1007-43
February-March 1982
(Tracker)

In February 1982, Citizens applied for a nearly $91,000, 9.6% tracker rate boost to cover the cost of its increased wholesale power rate; the IPUC approved it in March 1982.

CASE NO. U-1007-45
May 1982-March 1983

Company Application:

In May 1982, Citizens applied for a $155,000, 14% increase in its electric rates. The company said the increase was necessary to cover Idaho's share in total company cost increases - salary boosts and data processing expenses in particular. Citizens also requested an increase in its return on common equity from 14.11% to 17.78%.

A public hearing was held November 1982 at Wallace, during which an IPUC staff economist defended his recommendation that Citizens not receive any of its requested rate increase, citing the area's very unusual economic conditions. The Bunker Hill silver mine near Wallace had shut down just a few months before the rate increase proposal was submitted. The economist recommended setting aside traditional ratemaking methods to protect the economic health of both Citizens and its service area, noting that the utility could lose even more customers if the price of the communities' basic services increased.

During the course of the case, Citizens applied for a 10.4% tracker increase to cover the cost of its increased wholesale power price from WWP, which the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission had approved.

Granted by the Commission:

In March 1983, the IPUC granted Citizens a 2.2%, $24,000 increase in its electric rates. It also allowed the company its 10.4% tracker increase to cover higher WWP wholesale power costs. Together, the cases resulted in a 12.6% increase in Citizens' electric rates.

The Commission, in awarding Citizens only a fraction of its original request, denied the company's request to pass on all of its increased administrative costs to ratepayers. The commission called the utility's cost runups "shocking" and said Citizens was insensitive to the economic hardships experienced by its Silver Valley customers.

Citizens' authorized return on common equity was reduced form 14.11% to 13.5%.

The combination of the general rate case increase and the tracker boosted the price of 1,000 kwh for residential customers from $28.96 to $32.25 per month.

PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

Pacific Power and Light's Idaho customers experienced very sharp rate increases during the 1982-83 period.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, the price of 1,000 kilowatt hours for a residential customers (after the Bonneville Power Administration energy credit was subtracted) increased 77%, from $23.30 to $41.26.

More than anything else, PP&L's rate increases were caused by a PP&L-Washington Water Power Co. decision to phase out a long-standing program though which PP&L purchased wholesale from WWP all of the power it needed to supply its Idaho customers. WWP's power generation costs had been lower than PP&L's (although WWP's prices were expected to rise in the wake of its large thermal plant construction program).

By 1985, PP&L will be supplying Idaho customers with power entirely from its own system - a mix of thermal, hydroelectric and purchased power sources. By end 1983, PP&L was supplying 70% of the Idaho load with power from its own sources.

At the same time, even the remaining WWP wholesale power increased in price, boosting PP&L's Idaho rates even higher.

The IPUC had less control over PP&L's power costs than it did over most other Idaho energy rates. Neither the WWP-PP&L contract change nor the WWP wholesale rate increases were under the IPUC's jurisdiction; they were approved by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, which regulates wholesale power rates and transactions.

PP&L, a Portland, Oregon-based utility, serves 8,500 customers in the Sandpoint and Priest River areas.

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1046-104
September 1981-March 1982

Company Application:

In September 1981, Pacific Power and Light applied for a $790,000, 18.7% rate increase. Most of the request was related to higher costs and PP&L's ongoing construction program.

Under the company's proposal, residential rates would increase an average 21.2%, though they would be offset by the Bonneville

Power Administration's then new exchange credit, which would subsequently drop the rates by 4.7%.

PP&L also proposed an inverted rate plan for its residential customers to encourage conservation. The proposed inverted rate plan would charge customers 2 cents/kwh for the first 300 kwh used in the month, 2.71 cents/kwh for the next 300 kwh used in the summer months (or for the next 1,000 kwh used in the winter months) and 3.21 cents/kwh for all additional power consumed in the month.

A residential customer using 1,000 kwh in any summer month would see a bill increase from $24.42 to $28.97 under the proposal; a customer using 2,000 kwh in any winter month would see an increase from $46.85 to $57.57.

PP&L requested an increase in its return on common equity from 13.15% to 16.25%.

Granted by the Commission:

In March 1982, the IPUC granted the company its rate increase in full, but held the ceiling return on common equity to 15.06%.

The IPUC also approved in full the company's residential inverted rate plan, but it ordered the $2 customer charge (over and above the regular charge per kwh) to be replaced with a $6 per month customer charge.

CASE NO. U-1046-111
March 1982

Tracker:

The IPUC granted PP&L in March 1982 a $292,000, 6.2% rate increase to cover Washington Water Power's higher wholesale power rate, approved by FERC.

CASE NO U-1046-115
August 1982-March 1983

Company Application:

In August 1982, PP&L applied for a $2.2 million, 45% rate increase. Of the total request, the company said that more than $1.5 million reflected its increased power cost for Idaho customers due to the phase out of PP&L's wholesale power supply from WWP. (WWP withdrew 25% of its supply during this first of four steps.)

The remainder of the request involved the company's application to increase its return on common equity from 15.06% to 17.5%, increased costs and an increase in the rate base (or PP&L investment in power plants and facilities) attributable to Idaho in the wake of the WWP phase out.

Granted by the Commission:

In December 1982, the IPUC allowed that portion of the rate increase request related to the 25% reduction in WWP's wholesale power supply - an overall $1.34 million, 25% rate increase.

In March 1983, the IPUC concluded the case by allowing an additional $348,000 rate increase - related largely to PP&L's increased rate base for Idaho.

The Commission reduced PP&L's return on common equity from 15.06% to 15%.

In total, the company received $1.69 million of the $2.2 million it requested.

The IPUC, however, allowed another $275,000 in the March order because of a March 1 increase in WWP's wholesale rate approved by FERC.

During the course of the rate case, three factors increased PP&L's rates: the $1.69 million increased allowed by the Commission in its general rate case, an increase in WWP's wholesale rate and a drop in the value of the Bonneville Power Administration's energy credit. During this time, the price of 1,000 kwh for a residential customer increased from $26.77 to $38.21.

INVERTED RATES

The Idaho Legislature in March 1982 prohibited inverted rates for residential electric customers for two years. Both Idaho Power Co. and Pacific Power and Light Co. had inverted rates in place that were removed after the legislation was signed into law. Washington Water Power Co. was allowed to continue with its inverted rate plan, due to a provision in the law that permitted the program to continue if it had been in effect before July 1, 1981.

The Legislature's decision followed weeks of heated debate over the fairneses of the rate design, which on Idaho Power's system, for example, charged 3.027 cents/kwh for the first 600 kwh used in the month, 3.568 cents/kwh for the next 600 kwh and 4.529 cents for all additional kwh.

The IPUC supported inverted rates on electric systems that were being forced to make expensive additions to their relatively inexpensive hydroelectric systems in order to meet residential growth. Electric space heating systems were popular in new homes, and the average price of power on hydroelectric systems was still relatively inexpensive.

Inverted rates were designed to discourage high use by pricing the extra power needed for electric space heating closer to its actual cost, or the cost of power from new plants. The IPUC hoped the policy would direct consumers toward decisions that ultimately would result in fewer new power plants and subsequently lower rates for all customers.

Opponents of the inverted rate plan argued that it discriminated against customers who already owned all-electric homes.

Shortly after the bill was passed, the IPUC complied by ordering flat rates for Idaho Power and PP&L. On the Idaho Power system, the flat rate raised monthly bills for 75-85% of its customers.

COGENERATION

The public debate over Idaho's cogeneration program continued throughout 1982 and 1983 as independent power producers - blueprints and proposed contracts in hand - lined up in considerable numbers to sell their power to the state's major electric utilities.

The independent power boom of 1982-1983 was a special interest to the Idaho Commission, which actively supported the push for smaller and decentralized energy sources mandated by Congress in the 1978 National Energy Act.

Electric utilities are required under the act to purchase power from anyone who can safely and reliably deliver it to their systems. The rates the utilities are required to pay cogenerators and small power producers were first set in December 1980 by the IPUC; they were based on each utility's own avoided cost - or the cost of power from the next major power project planned, which could be avoided through purchases of cogenerated power.

In 1982 and 1983, however, the Commission fine-tuned the calculation of avoided costs for Idaho Power Co. by figuring the cost of a stream of various power resources the utility could expect to acquire in the future, which included a mix of purchased power, thermal and hydroelectric plants.

But the important point remained: cogeneration rates were locked in, for the most part, usually for 35-year contracts - thus saving the ratepayers from project cost overruns and inflation often experienced by the large utilities building power projects. Small power producers' rates could not increase if their projects did not give them the returns they expected, or if they did not run as smoothly as planned.

The Commission held out much hope for cogeneration and small power development in Idaho. In the words of a 1982 order on an Idaho Power cogeneration matter, it said the utility could have "the ability to serve as a catalyst for economic growth in the state. Rather than building costly plants out-of-state, it could harness the power of Idaho streams, canals and irrigation ditches in cooperation with farmers, ranchers, canal companies and irrigation districts. It could enter into a partnership with the state's depressed forest products industry and its food processing industry to put waste heat from those industries to work. It could pump life into local municipal and county governments by aiding construction of municipal incineration facilities that produce electricity and by increasing the employment and tax base from diversified cogeneration and small power projects located throughout the state."

Despite what was at times very strong utility opposition to the rates for cogenerators and the amounts of power being offered, by the end of 1983, Idaho had more than 14 mw of cogenerated power on line among 20 wood-waste, hydroelectric and wind power projects. In addition, Potlatch Corp., although it had not yet signed a firm contract for the sale of power from its 31 mw Lewiston wood-waste plant, was delivering power to the Washington Water Power Co.

In addition to on-line power projects, Idaho utilities by year-end 1983 had contracts signed for the purchase of another 18.6 mw among seven projects. Many more potential power projects were under negotiation.

IDAHO POWER COGENERATION:

Most of Idaho's cogeneration development in 1982 and 1983 was linked to Idaho Power Co., the state's largest electric utility. For one, Idaho Power's avoided cost rates were the highest in the state. Secondly, much of the state's hydroelectric potential is in Idaho Power's service area, particularly in southern Idaho's Snake River Canyon and its agricultural canal system.

Idaho Power's last 1983 cogeneration status report (published in October 1983) showed the utility at that time had signed contracts for the purchase of about 21 mw of power from among 18 projects.

In addition, the company reported that it had another 159 mw of potential power from 80 proposed projects.

In 1982 and 1983, the utility's cogeneration program made considerable progress from its status in October 1981, when the IPUC, at the conclusion of an Idaho Power rate case, granted the company a rate of return on common equity on the lower end of the range of reasonableness (1/4 % lower than the mid-point of 15.5%) for its lack of commitment to cogeneration (and to conservation and consumer assistance).

Still, the company's outspoken opposition to the rates paid to cogenerators and to its obligation to purchase all available power was one of the most volatile electric utility issues before the Commission.

Afton Energy, Inc. Complaint:

In September 1982, the Commission ordered Idaho Power to sign a contract for the purchase of 6.5 mw of power from Afton Energy,

Inc., a firm developing a wood-waste power project on the Wyoming-Idaho border in Afton. The IPUC found, after hearing a complaint filed by Afton Energy, that Idaho Power had refused to sign with the cogeneration firm, in violation of federal law. Idaho Power finally signed the contract, but subsequently appealed to the Idaho Supreme Court, arguing that the IPUC did not have the authority to order a utility to sign contracts. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the IPUC, but granted Idaho Power a rehearing, leaving the question unresolved at year-end 1983.

John Koyle Complaint: In November 1982, the IPUC received a complaint from a Gooding farmer, John Koyle, who claimed Idaho Power would not sign a contract for the purchase of power from his 1200 kw hydro project on the Big Wood River. After a pubic hearing and a Commission order, Idaho Power signed the contract. In its 20-page December 1982 order, the IPUC said Idaho Power's "defiance of final ratemaking orders is unparalleled in the experience of the Commission." The IPUC stressed that Idaho Power must sign with qualifying producers at posted rates until they are changed after public proceedings.

Revised Cogeneration Rates:

In July 1983, after months of public hearings, the IPUC revised Idaho Power's cogeneration rates - lowering the rates for standard 35-year contracts from 7.1 cents/kwh to an average 6.24 cents/kwh (1983 rates). The IPUC agreed with many of the company's proposals on how cogenerators should be paid. For example, the IPUC allowed Idaho Power to pay seasonal rates: 5 cents/kwh in the spring and fall and 7.5 cents/kwh in the summer and winter (1983 rates), when demand is higher and hydroelectric souces are not working at capacity. Idaho Power also was allowed to pay cogenerators only for power actually delivered.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COGENERATION:

Washington Water Power's last 1983 cogeneration status report (August 1983) showed it was purchasing 4.052 mw of power from one wood-waste plant, one hydroelectric project and two wind facilities.

In addition, WWP reported that in its northern Idaho service area, there were six customers with projects producing nearly 40 mw for their own use. The two largest of these were Potlatch Corp., which can produce 31 mw of power at its Lewiston wood products plant and Woodpower Inc., which

generates 6.25 mw of power at the Plummer Pacific Crown Lumber Mill.

Potlatch Corp. Cogeneration Contract:

In January 1983, WWP announced that it would sign a contract for the purchase of Potlatch's wood-waste power, but only if it first received authority from the Idaho and Washington commissions to raise its rates to cover the cost of the new power. In June 1983, the IPUC tentatively approved a $3.5 million, 6.7% rate increase to cover Idaho's portion of the cost of the contract. But the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission denied WWP the rate relief, stalling the signing of the contract; at year-end 1983, the issue was unresolved.

Revised Cogeneration Rates:

In February 1983, the IPUC on its own motion opened a case to revise WWP's cogeneration rates. WWP subsequently proposed that the rate for plants not dependent on fluctuating streamflows (such as wood-waste burning facilities) remain at the established average rate of 5.2 cents/kwh for 35-year contracts. But the WWP proposal would drop by more than half the annual revenue a hydroelectric facility could expect. The company wanted to pay the highest prices for power in the months of December, January and February, when its need for power is at a peak. Hydroelectric facilities are their most productive during the spring runoff. Public hearings were held in October and November 1983, but the new rates were not established by year-end.

Idaho Hydro, Inc. Complaint:

The IPUC dismissed a complaint filed in February 1983 by Idaho Hydro, Inc. against WWP. Idaho Hydro had charged that WWP was not negotiating in good faith to purchase power from its proposed 4 mw Orofino Falls Power Project on Orofino Creek. The IPUC said the developer had not brought the project far along enough to warrant any Commission order forcing WWP to sign a contract. The Commission said Idaho Hydro had not thoroughly calculated the output it could expect from its facility and that the ownership of the project was still uncertain.

UTAH POWER AND LIGHT COGENERATION:

There was only a small amount of cogeneration activity on the UP&L system during 1982 and 1983.

At the end of 1983, UP&L had three projects signed up, for a total 1.88 mw: a 1.4 mw hydroelectric project on the Bear River owned by Last Chance Canal Co., a 400 kw hydroelectric project installed by the City of Preston in its water system, and an 80 kw hydroelectric project owned by Pancheri, Inc. of Howe.

UP&L's cogeneration rates were 5.66 cents/kwh by year-end 1983.

SWAN FALLS WATER RIGHTS ISSUE

Idaho's most critical water rights issue was rekindled in November 1982 when the Idaho Supreme Court ruled on a case involving Idaho Power Company's water rights at Swan Falls Dam - the midway point on the Snake River between the utility's three massive Hell's Canyon hydroelectric dams and the upstream points from which most of the state's irrigation water is diverted.

The case originated at the IPUC in 1977 when Boise attorney Matt Mullaney and 31 other Idaho residents filed a complaint with the Commission, charging that Idaho Power Co, was promoting Snake River diversions and therefore was failing to protect its water rights at Swan Falls.

Mullaney's complaint suggested that less water through Swan Falls could only result in less cheap hydroelectric power from the three downstream dams; the complaint asked for ratepayer compensation.

The complaint, though dismissed by the IPUC for lack of Commission jurisdiction over water rights, wound its way through District Court and to the Idaho Supreme Court, which in November 1982 affirmed that Idaho Power had subordinated its water rights at the Hell's Canyon dams to upstream irrigation, but that its water right at Swan Falls was not clear. The high court remanded the case to District Court to determine whether or not Idaho Power had, over the years, abandoned part of its 8,400 cfs water right at Swan Falls.

In an effort to establish its interest in preserving the water right, Idaho Power in March 1983 filed a complaint in District court against about 7,500 waterusers and the Idaho Department of Water Resources. The company asked the court to determine that the upstream waterusers' rights are subordinate to the company's rights for its Swan Falls, Bliss, Lower Salmon and Salmon hydroelectric facilities.

Meanwhile, the 1983 Idaho Legislature was unsuccessful at passing any definitive legislation on the subordination issues. Both houses passed Senate Bill 1180, which prohibited the IPUC from penalizing Idaho Power for any finding of failure to protect its water rights. But Gov. John Evans did not sign the bill.

The three commissioners' chief concern throughout the statewide debate was the Idaho Power ratepayers would be protected from power rates rising higher than they would have otherwise - whatever the outcome. The IPUC staff calculated that maximum upstream irrigation development (assuming all available water

were used for farmland expansion) would result in a drain of hydroelectric resources that would create the need for a 250 mw thermal power plant that would cost Idaho Power customers an estimated $53.8 million annually (17% more than its current cost of operation).

The issue was unresolved at year-end 1983.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

Intermountain Gas Co. rates remained relatively stable during the 1982-83 period. A domestic natural gas surplus tended to drop wholesale prices charged by IGC's supplier, Northwest Pipeline Co. of Salt Lake City. The pipeline's Canadian gas purchases also declined in cost for the first time in a decade.

The company received a 5.7% rate increase in April 1982 to pass through a considerable wholesale price increase; it also received a 4% boost in November 1982 at the conclusion of its 1982 general rate case.

Those increases, however, were largely offset by the three rate decreases that followed in late 1982 and 1983 as wholeslae gas prices began dropping: a nearly 3% drop in November 1982, a 3% drop in April 1983 and a 3.4% drop in September 1983.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, Intermountain's residential charge for 10 therms per month rose from an average $8.92 to $9.88, for 30 therms per month, from $22.76 to $23.74 and for 90 therms from $58.14 to $60.11.

The most significant development for Intermountain was the loss of its two major industrial customers: Beker Industries and Simplot Co.; both companies use natural gas as a feedstock in the manufacture of fertilizers in southeastern Idaho. Together, the companies had provided Intermountain with approximately one-quarter of its total natural gas sales. When the compaies began purchasing gas from Southwest Gas. Corp. of Las Vegas, Nev. in late 1981, the IPUC allowed Intermountain to charge Beker and Simplot a per-therm fee for transporting the out-of-state gas over its gas pipeline. By 1983, however, even revenues from transportation fees dropped, due to significantly reduced markets for fertilizers.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS CO. RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1034-99
April-November 1982

Company Application:

Intermountain Gas Co. applied in April 1982 for a 7.4%, $10.1 million rate increase that subsequently was lowered to a 6.4%, $8.7 million request. The company proposed to raise residential rates by 13% or by $9.19 per month, from $66.34 to $75.53 for typical customers using 100 therms in any given winter month.

The company also proposed a 10.3% increase for commercial customers and a 1.9% increase for large industrial customers.

Intermountain's application included a request to raise its authorized return on common equity from 15.75% to 18%. It also proposed a "revenue stabilization plan," or a new accounting procedure through which rates would be set once per year, based on the degree to which sales volumes exceeded or fell below pre-set levels, established after public hearings.

The gas company also proposed declining block rates, or rates that drop once the customer's consumption reached a certain level.

The company said its need for rate relief was related to declining sales volumes. Residential sales dropped somewhat, due to conservation. More significant, however, was the company's 1982 loss of its two largest customers, Simplot and Beker.

Granted by the Commission:

In November 1982, the IPUC granted Intermountain a $5.5 million, 4% rate increase that resulted in an 8.3% boost in the average residential space heating bill and a 6% increase for residents using gas for both space and water heating.

The IPUC turned down the company's request for increased monthly customer charges and its proposed revenue stabilization plan. It also ordered the company to flow back to ratepayers its deferred state income taxes, and held its return on common equity steady at 15.75%, or 12.1% overall.

OTHER INTERMOUNTAIN GAS ISSUES

Transportation Rate: In January 1982, Intermountain was authorized to charge a fee of 1.5 cents per therm to any Idaho customer transporting more than 100,000 therms per day of out-of-state gas over Intermountain lines for use as feedstock in the manufacture of fertilizer. The transportation rate was approved after Beker Industries of Conda and J.R. Simplot of Pocatello contracted to purchase gas from Southwest Gas Corp. The IPUC also established a rate of 3.5 cents per therm for the tranport of gas used for other purposes.

Gas Incentive Programs: The IPUC in April 1983 approved a $200 cash rebate program for Intermountain customers installing new high efficiency natural gas heating equipment. The company since 1981 had been offering low-interest loans to residential customers installing the high-tech furnaces. By the end of 1983, it had loaned $5 million. Now it is offering both options. After December 1983, however, the lending rate was increased from 3 points below the prime, to 2 points above.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.
(Gas Operations)

See Washington Water Power Co.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

During 1982 and 1983, the IPUC turned much of its attention to the historic upheavals taking place in the telephone industry.

First the Commission was faced with a major federal effort to change the way telephone services in the country are financially supported.

Second, the IPUC took an active interest in protecting Idaho's interests during the course of the massive divestiture of the 22 Bell operating companies from AT&T.

The Commission's foremost concern was that deregulation of many components of the telephone industry would lower rates for services where competition was allowed (such as long-distance and phone equipment), but boost rates for basic phone services.

If minimum phone rates increased substantially, the Commission found, the resulting low-income customer disconnects could threaten the universality of Idaho's telephone network.

The IPUC vigorously opposed the Federal Communications Commission's plan to begin customer access charges for interstate long-distance availability in January 1984.* The controversy over access charges - charges that generally were supported by the telephone industry - became for many the most representative struggle between the push for increased competition in telecommunications and the state regulators' determination to keep basic phone services reasonably price and available to all.

Meanwhile, the impending AT&T divestiture also meant that on Jan. 1, 1984, all of Bell's in-place phone equipment would become the property of an unregulated AT&T. The IPUC in April 1983 therefore allowed Mountain Bell to sell to customers any single-line phone sets they had been leasing; it also was allowed to sell any new phone sets it had in inventory. Phone set sale and amortization plans were later begun for Continental and General Telephone Co. customers.

---

*Interstate access charges approved by the FCC would have been $2/mo. for residents and $6/mo. for businesses, beginning January 1984. The residential access charge would have reached $4/mo. by January 1986. The FCC has now postponed the residential charge until mid-1985, but business access charges were scheduled to begin in mid-1984.

Finally, improved and one-party phone service became available to many rural Idaho communities for the first time during 1982 and 1983. A 1980 Commission order requiring Mountain Bell to convert all of its customers to one-party service by 1986 meant that by the end of 1983, Bell had private-line-only service in 20 additional communities. In addition to the private lines, customers in those communities had direct long-distance for the first time, as well as the company's new custom-calling services.

Phone service was also dramatically improved on the Lemhi Telephone Co. system in the Salmon area and on the Gem State Utilities system in the Bruneau area, where many residents had phone service for the first time. There were also service improvements in the southwestern Idaho section of Continental Telephone's service area and at Troy Telephone Co. in northern Idaho.

IDAHO MOUNTAIN BELL

Looming on the horizon of the IPUC's 1982 and 1983 regulation of Mountain Bell was the mammoth AT&T divestiture, which took place on Jan. 1, 1984.

The federally-mandated terms of the antitrust suit settlement between the U.S. Justice Dept. and AT&T removed the Bell companies from the AT&T umbrella - a move, along with FCC policy decisions, that took away some of Mountain Bell's traditional money-makers, such as phone equipment rentals and inter-LATA long-distance service (long-distance between northern and souththern Idaho).

The Idaho Commission feared that the Bell breakup, combined with FCC decisions aimed at removing long-distance sharing of responsibility for local phone networks, would threaten the reasonable rates, service and general viability of Idaho's telephone system.

The IPUC was concerned during this time that local phone company revenues and FCC-mandated customer access charges could double or triple local phone rates before 1990.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, the IPUC authorized three rate increases for Idaho Mountain Bell, only one related to the effects of divestiture. During this time, the price of the company's one-party residential rates rose an average $2.57 per month.

Idaho Mountain Bell has about 240,000 customers in southern Idaho.

IDAHO MOUNTAIN BELL RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1000-55
October 1981-April 1982

Company Application:

Mountain Bell applied in October 1982 for a $23.9 million, 18.3% overall rate increase. Under the proposal, basic monthly rates for local residential and business service would have increased 31%, or by $2-$3 per month. Residential hookup charges were proposed to increase 162%. Bell also asked for authority to lower its intrastate long-distance rates by 15%.

Bell officials said the company required an increase in its return on common equity from 12.5% to 17.5%, revenue to cover

construction costs that had totalled $151 million over the three previous years, and accelerated depreciation of its equipment.

Public hearings were held at Boise in January and March 1982.

Granted by the Commission:

In April 1982, the IPUC awarded the company a $7.9 million, 8.6% increase that raised residential rates an average 8.9% and rates for one-party residential service between 7% and 17%, depending on the exchange. One-party business rates were raised 10-25%. New residential hookup charges were increased by 86%.

The IPUC allowed an increase in weekend and evening long-distance discounts, kept daytime long-distance rates for short calling distances within the state the same, and raised daytime long-distance rates for calls over greater distances.

Mountain Bell was not allowed to accelerate its depreciation rates, but it was authorized to raise its return on common equity from 12.5% to 14%.

CASE NO. U-1000-61
October-November 1982

Company Application:

Mountain Bell applied in October 1982 for a $4.24 million, 3.5% tracker increase designed to cover the increased 1982 costs the company claimed was eroding its ability to earn the return authorized by the IPUC in its last rate case.

The higher costs included an FCC-mandated increase in its depreciation rate and wage and salary increases granted in 1982. No request was made to change its rate of return or capital structure.

Granted by the Commission:

The Commission granted the tracker increase in full in November 1982 after a public hearing. Nearly all telephone rates were increased a uniform 3.5%.

CASE NO. U-1000-63
December 1982-July 1983

Company Application:

Mountain Bell applied in December 1982 for a $34 million, 24% rate increase. It was one of the most significant telephone

rate cases in Idaho's history because of the very large increases the company proposed for basic services: 87%-119% for residential rates and 53%-73% for local business rates. Local rate increases would have been even higher in rural areas because the company requested a 75% increase in rural zone charges - substantial monthly surcharges paid by geographically remote customers, depending on their distance from the local exchange. In contrast, Bell proposed a 15% decrease in intrastate long-distance rates, an area it claimed was subject to increasing competition.

The company asked for an increase in its authorized return on common equity from 14% to 17%.

On March 22, the IPUC granted the company an interim $5.8 million, 4.5% increase to cover the FCC-mandated increase in its depreciation rate and a return on some $13 million it had invested in service improvements around the state. The interim increase boosted one-party local residential rates 30-40 cents per month.

The IPUC held its major evidentiary hearings in March and May 1982 at Boise. In addition, the Commission travelled to Payette, Gooding and Blackfoot in March 1982 to hold evening hearings and collect public testimony.

Granted by the Commission:

In July 1983, the IPUC awarded Mountain Bell the balance of its rate increase, bringing it to a total $15.6 million, 12.3% boost. In total, the rate case brought about increases in local residential rates of 13.6%-20.4%, depending on the exchange. Intrastate long-distance rates were increased by 5%, phone set lease charges by 10%, and custom calling rates by 40%.

The most significant outcome of the case was the Commission's rejection of the company's argument that long-distance revenues have historically subsidized local exchange rates. The IPUC found that the phone company was using a cost study that did not properly account for the value of the local phone network on which long-distance business depends. The IPUC found instead that long-distance was not contributing enough to the joint costs it shares with the local exchanges. The Commission criticized Mountain Bell for insisting that basic exchange customers bear the entire cost of the system's backbone plant (through higher rates) while trying to give long-distance and other services a "free ride."

The Commission also took the opportunity to speak out against an FCC mandate that all telephone customers begin paying flat monthly access charges for the privilege of making and receiving interstate long-distance calls. The IPUC ordered the company to make access charges optional for customers who

either do not make out-of-state calls or who otherwise would have been forced to disconnect because of the higher total monthly phone chargges. (The FCC has since postponed its Janaury 1984 access charges for residents, although the business access charges were expected to begin mid-1984.)

Mountain Bell was not allowed to increase its return on common equity; it was held steady at 14%.

CASE NO. U-1000-70
October 1983 -

Company Application:

In October 1983, Idaho Mountain Bell applied for a $21.8 million, 19.3% rate increase designed to recover the revenues it expected to lose in the wake of its January 1984 divestiture from AT&T. Mountain Bell after that time, for instance, could no longer collect revenues from the lease or sale of telephone equipment (it became the property of AT&T) and could no longer offer long-distance service between northern and southern Idaho. Mountain Bell also expected higher capital costs as a subsidiary of its new holding company, U.S. West.

By year-end 1983, the phone company had reduced its request to a $15.9 million increase.

Public hearings began in December at Boise.

Granted by the Commission:

In December 1983, the IPUC granted the phone company part of its request - a $3.84 million, 3.43% rate increase to cover only the specific revenue losses the company was certain to experience after divestiture.

The second round of hearings, to hear IPUC staff and intervenor testimony, was scheduled to take place March 6-9 at Boise.

<u>OTHER MOUNTAIN BELL ISSUES</u>:

<u>One-Party Universal Service (OPUS) Program</u>:
Idaho Mountain Bell made one-party phone service available to all customers to 20 new communities in 1982 and 1983. The phone company was responding to a July 1981 IPUC decision ordering the company to convert all of its multi-party lines to single lines for its customers by 1986. The company by end 1983 had extended one-party service to: west Boise, southwest Boise, Island Park, Lewisville-Menan, Ririe, Blackfoot, Franklin, Firth, Buhl, Nampa, Arco, Middleton, Driggs, American Falls, Wendell, Glenns Ferry, McCammon, Howe, Montpelier and

Jerome. The cost of the program is covered by slighty higher rates put into effect each Jan. 1 until the program is completed.

Extended Area Service Petitions:
Mountain Bell received three petitions for extended area service during this period: one from Melba residents wanting toll-free calling to Caldwell, another from Eden and Hazelton customers requesting toll-free calling to Twin Falls and elsewhere in the Magic Valley, and from Island Park residents wanting toll-free calling to anywere within Fremont Co., which includes St. Anthony and Ashton. The IPUC turned down the Melba and Island Park petitions, and ordered further cost studies on the Eden-Hazelton proposal.

Customer Premises Equipment Sale:
The Commission in April 1983 gave Mountain Bell the go-ahead to sell to customers the single line phone sets they had been leasing in their homes and businesses. The sale of the so-called Big Six phones (rotary and touchtone versions of the standard, princess and trimline models) was optional and lasted through the end of 1983. The company sold 44,704 in-place phone sets and another 9,942 from its inventory - a response rate of approximately 20%, one of the highest in the Bell system.

Inside Wiring:
In April 1982, the IPUC authorized Mountain Bell to give its customers the option of maintaining their own inside wiring. Residential customers willing to assume responsibility for their inside wiring were given monthly reductions in their bills.

GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE NORTHWEST

General Telephone Co. applied for two major rate increases during the 1982-83 period.

The Everett, Washington-based company is the second-largest provider of telephone service in the state, with 66,500 customers in northern Idaho.

General Telephone responded in a number of ways to FCC decisions encouraging deregulation in the telephone industry. In 1983, General Telephone offered its customers the option of purchasing their in-place telephone sets instead of leasing. In addition, the Commission the same year authorized the company to amortize over a two-year period its investment in so-called customer premise equipment, or CPE; residents would then own their phones at the end of the two years. Customers deciding to purchase their phones all at once were not charged the small monthly amortization fee. Business phone equipment was amortized over four years.

The phone company followed FCC rules and accelerated its depreciation rates. It also allowed its customers to maintain their own inside wiring to avoid the company's traditional monthly charge.

General Telephone responded to perceived competitive pressures by seeking to lower its rates for more advanced business equipment and special customer services. The IPUC generally disapproved of such price drops in competitive areas if they were funded by rate increases for basic phone service.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, the average bill for 1-party residential service rose by an average 7.1%.

GENERAL TELEPHONE RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1002-43
October 1981-August 1982

Company Application:

General Telephone applied in October 1981 for a $5.6 million, 19% rate increase. Under the proposal, monthly rates for local residential and business customers would have increased an average 25.6%. Basic one-party residential rates would have jumped from between $6.35 and $8.80 to between $7.08 and $9.37 (depending on the community). The price of a coin phone call was proposed to increase from 10 to 25 cents.

General Telephone officials said the increase was needed to pay for a substantial construction and improvement program, increased costs and for a proposed increase in common equity from 14.28% to 14.75% return on equity.

Granted by the Commission:

In August 1982, the IPUC granted General Telephone a $2.49 million, 9.1% increase that raised local residential and business rates by an average 7%. Basic one-party residential rates increased from between $6.35 and $8.80 per month to between $6.70 and $9.22 per month (not including extra charges in some exchanges with extended area service, or the ability to call toll-free within a wider area).

The phone company was allowed to increase its return on commmon equity from 14.25% to 14.75%, raising its authorized overall return from 10.15% to 11.9%.

Lease charges for standard rotary phones increased from 60 cents to $1 per month and coin phone charges from 10 to 25 cents. Customers with extended area service saw EAS charges rise by an average 37.2%.

CASE NO. U-1002-45
November 1982-August 1983

Company Application:

General Telephone applied in November 1982 for a $7 million, 24% overall increase that would have boosted local residential and business rates by an average 43%. Basic one-party residential rates were proposed to increase from between $6.78 and $9.22 per month to between $9.72 and $13.22 per month. The company proposed an increase in the standard rotary phone lease charge of [illegible] cents per month and a 1-1/2% charge on unpaid monthly balances. Extra mileage charges for customers living outside of local exchanges would increase 39%.

The company said it needed the increase to cover short-term construction work in progress, increased expenses and a proposed increase in its common equity from 14.75% to 17.5%. In addition, the company argued for revenue to cover the FCC's mandate that it accelerate depreciation of its equipment.

Granted by the Commission:

In February 1983, the IPUC allowed the phone company a uniform 4.[illegible]% increase to cover the cost of the accelerated depreciation program mandated by the FCC.

In August 1983, the IPUC concluded the rate case by granting the company a total $1.03 million, 7.2% increase (part of which was granted in March). But because the Commission finally

decided that local exchange rates should increase by only 1.9% in total (they were increased on an interim basis by 4.4%), they were dropped in August by 2.5%, or by between 17 and 25 cents per month for one-party residential customers.

Phone set lease charges were allowed to increase by 25 cents per month for a standard rotary phone. About 75% of the company's customers, paying extra mileage charges, saw that rate increase by 33%. The IPUC rejected the company's proposal to levy late charges for unpaid bills.

The IPUC denied the company's request for short-term construction work in progress. It disallowed many advertising expenses and lowered the company's return on common equity from 14.75% to 14.1%.

The IPUC increased rates more substantially for advanced business equipment and special services in order to keep basic rates as low as possible.

OTHER GENERAL TELEPHONE ISSUES:

Priest Lake Line Extension: The IPUC received in May 1981 a request from 26 Priest Lake residents wanting General Telephone to extend phone service to the north end of the lake. The line extension project was estimated to cost about $200,000. In August 1982, the IPUC ordered the company to provide the service, noting the presence of a large state park, residents with no access to an emergency phone and potential homesite development in the area. Shortly thereafter, the Commission approved revisions to General Telephone's line extension rates that resulted in larger up-front payments from potential customers who request service. By the end of 1983 the Priest Lake petitioners had not yet chosen to receive service.

Priest River-Priest Lake-Oldtown-Sandpoint Extended Area Service Petition: The IPUC in 1982 received three separate petitions with 1,700 signatures requesting toll-free calling between the Priest River, Priest Lake, Oldtown and Sandpoint exchanges. The IPUC turned down the request in August 1982, but ordered General Telephone to provide discount Preferred Area Calling (PAC) rates for frequent long-distance callers between those communities.

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE WEST

Continental Telephone's regulation during the 1982-83 period was highlighted by only one major rate case.

Like other telephone companies in Idaho, Continental's operations during this time were significantly affected by FCC decisions, particularly those allowing their customers to own the telephones they had leased and permitting them to maintain their own inside phone wiring. The FCC also raised Continental's allowable costs by requiring the company to accelerate the depreciation of its equipment.

In addition, Continental followed the FCC's lead by supporting (along with most other Idaho phone companies) proposed customer access charges. The charges would have required customers - not the long-distance companies - to pay for that portion of the local phone facilities needed to make long-distance calls possible. Continental joined an Idaho telephone industry task force that attempted to establish such access charges for the privilege of making and receiving in-state long-distance calling. The proposal was turned down by the IPUC.

Continental has 13,000 customers in nearly 20 rural Idaho communities.

Between January 1982 and December 1983, increases for one-party local residential bills ranged from 75 cents to $3.30 per month. One-party residential rates range from $8.05 to $8.80 in January 1982; they increased to the $8.80-$12.10 range by December 1983.

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE RATE CASES:

CASE NO. U-1039-48
March 1983-September 1983

Company Application:

Continental applied in March 1983 for a $1.7 million, 27% rate increase that would have raised its local rates and charges by an average 75% and, for example, would have raised local one-party residential rates by between 79% and 126%. The company also asked for permission to raise is coin phone rate from 10 to 25 cents, increase its optional inside wire maintenance charge by 25 cents per month and increase directory listing charges by 10%.

Continental officials said the raise was needed to cover an increase in expenses and its ongoing construction program. The phone company sought Construction Work in Progress funding for its short-term projects. An increase in its return on common equity from 13% to 17.5% also was requested.

Granted by the Commission:

The IPUC in May 1983 allowed Continental part of its rate increase request - the $251,000, 11.5% boost mandated by the FCC, which required telephone companies to accelerate the depreciation of their facilities.

In September 1983, the Commission concluded the case by allowing the company an additional $288,000, 4.67% increase.

In total, Continental received a $539,000, 8.75% rate increase that boosted local rates and charges by an average 24%.

The IPUC allowed an increase in coin phone rates from 10 to 25 cents, increases in directory listing charges and an increase in the basic price of a new phone hookup from $20.25 to $30 for residents and from $30 to $50 for businesses.

Continental was allowed to increase its return on common equity from 13% to 14.25%.

OTHER CONTINENTAL ISSUES:

Extended Area Service Petition:
The IPUC in June 1982 ordered Continental and Mountain Bell to offer toll-free calling between the southwestern Idaho communities of Marsing and Sunnyslope. The order was in response to a petition from more than 100 Continental customers in Marsing, Homedale, Parma and Wilder seeking toll-free calling to Mountain Bell's Caldwell exchange. The IPUC compromised by authorizing the toll-free service between Continental customers in Marsing and Mountain Bell customers in Sunnyslope, two communities divided by the Snake River. However, because of engineering considerations, the companies elected to provide toll-free calling from the Marsing exchange to the entire Caldwell exchange. The cost of the new service was shared by Continental and Bell customers.

Banks Service Complaint:

In 1982, Continental responded to the complaints of 17 Banks residents who had poor phone reception and frequent outages. The company spent $6500 to install neutralizing transformers to correct an induction into telephone cable from power transmission lines.

OTHER TELEPHONE COMPANIES

Pacific Northwest Bell:
PNB in October 1983 was granted in full its request for a $1.04 million, 12.4% rate increase for its 20,500 customers in the Lewiston-Grangeville area - the first Idaho rate increase PNB had since 1976. The move boosted Lewiston-area rates up to the level they were in Clarkston, Wash., just across the Snake River from Lewiston. Basic local rates increased an average 56% - or from $5.65 to $8.75 per month for one-party residential service in Lewiston.

Lemhi Telephone Co.:
Lemhi Telephone Co. of Salmon applied in May 1983 for a $521,000, 128% rate increase for its 3,500 customers in the rural eastern Idaho communities of Salmon, North Fork and Leadore. The request was to cover the cost of a massive $6 million upgrade project the company undertook after the IPUC ordered it to improve service. Customers had complained in the late 70s and early 80s of poor phone reception, frequent outages and too many customers on one multi-line. After a public hearing at Salmon, the IPUC in December 1983 granted Lemhi a $477,000, 115% increase that raised basic one-party residential rates in Salmon from $6.75 to $14.40 per month and multi-party residential service from $3.75 to $8.65 per month.

Silver Star Telephone Co.:
Silver Star Telephone Co. of Afton, Wyo, applied in December 1982 for a $19,105, 70.8% rate increase for its 250 customers in the tiny eastern Idaho community of Irwin. The company said the increase request was designed to boost revenues back up to the level it earned before the IPUC ordered its rates lowered in July 1981. (The IPUC ordered the company's rates dropped by 33.3% after it found during a general rate case that its charges were excessive and its service was poor.) The phone company eventually dropped its December 1982 application, but the IPUC allowed the company to increase service connection charges for its customers in March 1983. The IPUC also held a public hearing in April 1982 after receiving numerous complaints of poor service from customers on the company's Wayan exchange. Silver Star was subseqently ordered to make a number of service improvements.

Midvale Telephone Co:
In September 1982, Midvale Telephone was granted a $8,590, 7.2% rate boost - part of the $10,181 increase it requested.

OTHER TELEPHONE ISSUES

Telephone Records-Customer Privacy:
After 1981 public hearings, the IPUC set up new rules requiring telephone companies to notify any customer whose telephone records have been summoned, subpeonaed or requested without a legal process. Phone companies must notify the affected customers within two business days unless a judicial officer orders the company not to disclose to the customer that his or her records have been obtained.

Discount Long-Distance Rates for the Disabled:
The IPUC authorized half-price long-distance rates for people who, because of any disability, must use a teletypewriter to communicate over the phone. Before, the discount applied only to the deaf; the February 1982 ruling extended the discount to those with other disabilities, such as severe cerebral palsy or stroke.

INTRASTATE ACCESS CHARGE PROPOSAL

The IPUC in December 1983 rejected an Idaho telephone industry proposal to begin charging all of the state's individual phone customers a 30 cents to $2 per month access charge for the privilege of having intrastate long-distance service. The September 1983 proposal came in the wake of a study completed over a three-month period by the Idaho Intrastate Access Charge Committee.

The committee, made up of representatives from nearly all of the state's phone companies, was set up to establish a system to compensate Idaho's local exchange companies for the costs they incur linking their customers to long-distance facilities.

Before the AT&T divestiture, the independent phone companies were compensated through a "settlements" arrangement: an annual payment based on each company's investment in local facilities used to complete both interstate and intrastate long-distance calls. The payment was adjusted whenever the IPUC altered Mountain Bell's authorized overall return.

With the FCC's scheduled January 1, 1984 interstate customer access charge program on the horizon (it was subsequently delayed until 1985), independent phone companies expected compensation from their customers for their interstate-related long-distance costs. The committee wanted in-state access charges pay for the rest of their costs; together, the interstate and intrastate access charge payments from customers would take the place of their settlements arrangement.

But the IPUC in December 1983 called the intrastate access charge proposal an "unfair head tax" on consumers - levied regardless of how many long-distance calls a household made. The Commission ordered the companies to gather the revenue by instead charging interLATA intrastate long-distance companies--such as AT&T--for access into the local phone networks. IntraLATA intrastate toll settlements procedures were ordered to continue.

WATER COMPANIES

In 1982 and 1983, the Commission conducted 16 separate proceedings involving water rates, certifications and water company policies.

Of the 20 water companies regulated by the IPUC, most are small and serve residential developments on the outskirts of established municipal systems.

During this time, the Commission was faced with major rate increase requests from Idaho smallest water companies, many owned by subdivision owners that had made large capital investments in the systems.

During the 1982 and 1983 legislative sessions, the IPUC tried unsuccessfully to stimulate interest in legislation that would have shifted responsibility for regulating small water company rates to local governments.

Boise Water Corp., the largest water company regulated by the IPUC with 38,500 customers, was granted in December 1982 a $652,000, 9% increase.

Citizens Utilities Co., in March 1983 received a $40,000, 9.2% increase in its water rates - less than the 29% increase it sought.

REGULATED CARRIER

During 1982 and 1983, the IPUC wrestled with two major transportation issues of particular interest to the public: proposals to close dozens of rural railroad agency stations and the abandonment of several Greyhound passenger bus routes.

Both Union Pacific and Burlington Northern - the state's largest rail freight shippers - began computerizing their operations in the early 1980s, making it possible for customers to telephone central offices for their shipping and billing information.

As a result, the Commission received numerous applications for rural station agency closures. The railroads argued that they could save money by closing many on-site services and offering customers toll-free calls to regional service centers equipped with computers. In some communities, there was opposition from local shippers and businesses who argued that service would be impaired without personal contact with a railroad agent.

During 1982 and 1983, the Commission ordered the railroads to leave some stations open, but allowed the closure of UP station agencies at Victor, Driggs, Tetonia, Horseshoe Bend, Rigby, Ririe, Menan, Meridian, Malad, Downey, McCammon and Sugar City. BR agencies at Moscow, Potlatch and Bonners Ferry were allowed to close, as was Camas Prairie's agency at Kamiah.

By the end of 1983, Union Pacifc had applied for permission to close station agencies in 26 additional Idaho communities and instead establish regional service centers in eight locations: Nampa, Emmett, Pocatello, Idaho Falls, Lewiston, Spokane, Rupert and Twin Falls.

Public hearings were expected to take place in 1984.

Meanwhile, Greyhound Bus Lines, Inc. applied for permission to close its most unprofitable routes in Idaho - six routes extending into rural areas off the state's major east-west Interstate 84. The IPUC granted Greyhound permission. The Bus Regulatory Reform Act, passed by Congress in 1982, would have allowed Greyhound to immediately appeal the IPUC decision to the federal Interstate Commerce Commission. The act was designed to give bus companies more opportunities to trim cost and improve revenues by eliminating unprofitable routes.

DISTRIBUTION OF INTRASTATE CARRIER PERMITS

PERMITS	1983		1984	
General Commodities Carriers	108	(22%)	112	(22%)
Passenger/Charter Carriers	29	(6%)	32	(6%)
Contract Carriers	76	(16%)	86	(17%)
Heavy Haulers	78	(16%)	84	(17%)
Mobile/Modular Carriers	46	(10%)	48	(9%)
Petroleum Carriers	31	(6%)	38	(7%)
Miscellaneous Carriers	116	(24%)	110	(22%)
Total No. of Common Contract Carrier Permits	484	(100%)	508	(100%)

DISTRIBUTION OF MOTOR CARRIERS

MOTOR CARRIERS	1983		1984	
Interstate Carriers	8,326	(58%)	9,033	(57%)
Priv. Carriers Intrast.	5,697	(39%)	6,305	(40%)
Intrast. Comm. Carriers	14,507		15,848	

DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUE BY SOURCES FOR

REVENUE AVAILABLE FISCAL YEARS 1983 and 1984

REVENUE COLLECTED	Calendar Year 1982		Calendar Year 1983	
Interstate Carriers Regulatory Fees	$218,836	(38%)	$233,083	(38%)
Private Intrastate Carrier Regulatory Fees	$101,346	(18%)	$133,169	(21%)
Railroad Special Regulatory Fees	$179,009	(31%)	$158,894	(25%)
Common/Contract Regulatory Fees	$ 58,985	(10%)	$ 83,253	(13%)
Filing Fees Miscellaneous Receipt	$ 17,900	(3%)	$ 17,050	(3%)
	$576,076		$625,449	

INVESTIGATORS PRODUCTION LOAD ANALYSIS
FOR FISCAL YEARS 79 80 81 82 83

CLASSIFICATION	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Court Actions Initiated	167	90	96	123	82
Warnings Issued	3287	1938	2970	2583	2610
Vehicles Inspected	3058	1664	1567	1595	1372
Accidents Investigated	50	48	50	48	57
Investigations (Compliance & Authority)	3073	2801	4359	3201	3122

NUMBER OF INVESTIGATORS EMPLOYED AT END
OF FISCAL YEARS 79 80 81 82 83

CLASSIFICATION	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Investigator Supervisor	0	0	0	0	0
Regulated Carrier Investigators	4	3	4	4	3

SUMMARY AND COMPARISON OF ORDERS ISSUED
BY COMMISSION ON REGULATED CARRIERS
FISCAL YEAR 1979-1983

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Authority Cases	142	141	183	131	130
Transfer Cases	40	41	28	16	19
Complaints, Suspensions and Reinstatements	157	110	89	55	74
Railroads	18	15	12	19	16
Cancellations	40	37	30	15	17
Miscellaneous	62	33	48	49	29
Notices	--	--	128	129	110
Rate Cases	--	--	232	186	132

UTILITIES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF
THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRIC UTILITIES

CITIZENS UTILITIES CO.
High Ridge Park
Stamford, Connecticut 06906
(203) 328-8800

Robert O'Brien, Asst. V.P.

612 Cedar Street
Wallace, Idaho 83873
752-1174

Jerry Zeller

IDAHO POWER CO.
P.O. Box 70
1220 West Idaho St.
Boise, Idaho 83707
383-2220

Don Barclay - 383-2292
Paul Bull - 383-2689
Wes Coryell - 383-2682
Larry Crowley - 383-2683
Dewey Hammond - 383-2655
John Willmorth - 383-2297

Boise - 383-2259
Caldwell - 459-4661
Emmett - 365-4493
Hailey - 788-2262
McCall - 634-2116

Meridian - 888-4491
Mtn. Home - 587-8411
Nampa - 466-2425
Pocatello - 233-2631
Twin Falls - 733-6880

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO.
Public Service Building
920 S.W. 6th Ave.
Portland, Oregon 97204
(503) 243-1122

Fred Gardner- (503) 243-4621
Steve Pearson-(503) 243-4966
David Sloan- (503) 243-4601
Tim Watson- (503) 243-4591
Phil Wogsberg-(503) 243-4597

Sandpoint - 263-3117

Bill Walman, Ofs. Mgr.

UTAH POWER & LIGHT CO.
P.O. Box 899
1407 West North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110
(801) 535-2000

Dean Bryner- (801) 535-4290
Orrin Colby- (801) 535-4040
Al Dunn- (801) 535-4141
Jim Taylor- (801) 535-4242

Preston - 852-1916

Rexburg - 356-7366

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.
P.O. Box 3727
E. 1411 Mission Ave. (99202)
Spokane, Washington 99220
(509) 489-0500

Coeur d'Alene - 664-2165
Lewiston - 743-5541

John Buergel - Ext. 2728
Tom Dukich - Ext. 2724
Tom Illich - Ext. 2515
Fran Kihara - Ext. 2341
Ron McKenzie - Ext. 2750

Moscow - 882-7551

GAS UTILITIES

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS CO.
P.O. Box 7608
555 So. Cole Road
Boise, Idaho 83707
377-6000

Chuck Hedemark - 377-6085
Jeff Lebens - 377-6055
Reed Penning - 377-6054
Skip Worthan - 377-6058

Emmett - 365-3004
Idaho Falls - 522-6095
Nampa - 467-7491
Payette - 642-3355

Pocatello - 237-1740
Twin Falls - 733-7163
Weiser - 549-0984

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.
P.O. Box 3727
E. 1411 Mission Ave. (99202)
Spokane, Washington 99220
(509) 489-0500

Bob McLenden - Ext. 2466

Coeur d'Alene - 664-2165
Lewiston - 743-5541

Moscow - 882-7511

PIPELINE COMPANY

HOLLY TERMINALS, INC. (P-1000)
2600 Diamond Shamrock Tower
717 No. Harwood Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 651-0311

Henry L. Stern

TELEPHONE UTILITIES

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MOUNTAIN STATES, INC.
P.O. Box 5020 (80217)
[illegible]75 Lawrence St., Rm. 1535
[illegible]nver, Colo. 80202
(303) 298-6130

Neil Hinchman

Bob Little
1 North Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59601
(406) 449-6776

AT&T MOUNTAIN, INC. (U-1143)
SAME AS AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

AT&T NORTHWEST COAST, INC. (U-1144)
SAME AS AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

ALBION TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 98
Albion, Idaho 83311
673-5335

Odeen Redman

CAMBRIDGE TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 86
Cambridge, Idaho 83601
257-3314

Richard Wiggins

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 5246
1350 Norris Road
Bakersfield, Calif. 93388
(805) 393-4011

R.W. Winchester- (805) 393-4491

P.O. Box 127
Homedale, Idaho 83628

Mike Blankenship - 337-3777

McCall - 634-5333

Aloa Stevens

GEM STATE UTILITIES
c/o Pacific Telecom, Inc.
P.O. Box 9901, 805 Broadway
Vancouver, Washington 98668
(206) 696-6941

Vern Dunham, V.P.
C.E. Robinson, Pres.
Romi Kanal (Tariffs)

GENERAL TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 1003
1800 41st Street
Everett, Washington 98201
Coeur d'Alene - 772-8311
Moscow - 882-0268

Rod Benson - (206) 258-5026
Bill Miller - (206) 258-5088
(206) 258-5321
Sandpoint - 263-0577, Ext. 204

TELEPHONE UTILITIES
(Cont'd.)

INLAND TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 171 Roslyn, Wash. 98914 (509) 649-2211	Harold Weis Ed MacKenzie
LEMHI TELEPHONE CO. Salmon, Idaho 83467 756-3300	Frank Barsalou
Century Telephone P.O. Box 111 (1905 Ward St.) LaCrosse, Wis. 54601 (608) 782-9980	Marvin Cunningham
P.O. Box 4065 Monroe, LA 71211 (318) 387-5541	Bruce Hanks
MIDVALE TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 7 Midvale, Idaho 83645 355-2211	Lane Williams
MOUNTAIN BELL TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 7888 Boise, Idaho 83723 385-2000	C.E. (Gene) Hill - 385-2628 Wayne Durnil - 385-2734 Jim Wozniak - 385-2030
PACIFIC NW BELL TELEPHONE 1600 Bell Plaza Seattle, Wash. 98191 (206) 345-5921	Mike Moran - (206) 345-5930 Bob McGinnis - (206) 345-4742 George Walker - (206) 345-3000
PINE TELEPHONE SYSTEM, INC. P.O. Box 706 Halfway, Ore. 97834 (503) 742-2201	Rodney Huff, Pres.
POTLATCH TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 121 Kendrick, Idaho 83537 289-5701	Don Eichner
ROCKLAND TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 269 Rockland, Idaho 83271 548-2345	Leonard May

TELEPHONE UTILITIES
(Cont'd)

RURAL TELEPHONE CO. — Wayne Irwin
6110 Garfield Ave.
P.O. Box 41957
Sacramento, Calif. 95841
(916) 331-5131

SILVER STAR TELEPHONE CO. — Melvin Hoopes
Freedom, Wyo. 83120
(307) 883-2411

TROY TELEPHONE CO. — Jerry Brown
P.O. Box 25
Troy, Idaho 83871
835-2211

Telephone & Data Systems — Charles Ricker
P.O. Box 5158
517 North Segoe
Madison, Wis. 53
(608) 845-67

WATER UTILITIES

BARBER WATER CORPORATION 3550 Triplett Lane Boise, Idaho 83702	345-9384 Dave Triplett
BAR CIRCLE "S" RANCH, INC. 2951 No. Government Way Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814	667-4621 Robert Turnipseed
BOISE WATER CORPORATION P.O. Box 7488 Boise, Idaho 83707	362-1300 Ben Hepler - 362-2618
BRIAN WATER CORPORATION P.O. Box 7345 Boise, Idaho 83707	342-4791 Larry Eno
CAPITOL SECURITIES WATER CORP. 2626 Eldorado Boise, Idaho 83704	375-0931 R. (Bob) Price
CITIZENS UTILITIES WATER 612 Cedar Street Wallace, Idaho 83873	752-1174 Jerry Zeller
CLEARVIEW WATER CORP. 1811 North 32nd Boise, Idaho 83703	342-1619 Gordon Pittenger
EAGLE RANCH WATER COMPANY P.O. Box 455 Eagle, Idaho 83616	939-0242 R. (Bob) DeShazo
EAST MORELAND WATER CO. 270 N.E. Main Street Blackfoot, Idaho 83221	785-5450 L.A. Jacobsen
EVER-GREEN LANDSCAPING, INC. Portneuf Road, Box 4404 Inkom, Idaho 83245	775-3573 Jerry Dunne
FALLS WATER COMPANY, INC. 405 11th Street Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401	522-1300 Kelly Howell
HAYDEN PINES WATER CO. 8601 No. Hayden Pines Way Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835	772-3619 C. (Bud) Ford

WATER UTILITIES
(Cont'd.)

HILLCREST WATER CORP. P.O. Box 7927 Boise, Idaho 83707	375-7200 Jack Rencher
KETCHUM SPRING WATER SUPPLY CO., INC. P.O. Box 1498 Hailey, Idaho 83333	788-4051 Wilhelmus Touw
MURRAY WATERWORKS (U-1039) Box 426 Murray, Idaho 83874	(509) 924-2789 Harry Almquist
NORTHGATE ENTERPRISES P.O. Box 2432 Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401	523-2251 Jerry Ferguson
PICABO LIVESTOCK COMPANY Picabo, Idaho 83348	788-2516 Leonard Purdy
RATHDRUM PRAIRIE WATER CO., INC. P.O. Box 1090 Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835	667-2435 Larry Gilman
SOUTH COUNTY WATER CO., INC. P.O. Box 7361 Boise, Idaho 83707	375-1130 Keith Stokes
SPIRIT LAKE EAST WATER CO. c/o Hanson Properties, Box 7310 Spokane, Washington 99207	(509) 467-0770 Frank Carr
SUNBEAM WATER CO. P.O. Box 5361 Pocatello, Idaho 83201	237-1110 Allen Frew
SUNSET HEIGHTS WATER CO. Route 1, Box 224-50 Salmon, Idaho 83467	756-3611 Ralston Adams
TROY HOFFMAN WATER CORP. 920 Hoffman Avenue Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814	664-6208 June Shuster
WARM SPRINGS MESA, INC. 2843 Star Circle Boise, Idaho 83706	344-2603 Paul Wise

COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC UTILITIES OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

CLEARWATER POWER CO.
P.O. Box 997
Lewiston, Idaho 83501
743-1501

EAST END MUTUAL ELECTRIC CO.
528 "E" Street
Rupert, Idaho 83350
436-9357

FALL RIVER RURAL ELECTRIC
714 Main Street
Ashton, Idaho 83420
652-7431

IDAHO COUNTY LIGHT & POWER
P.O. Drawer B
Grangeville, Idaho 83530
983-1610

KOOTENAI ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
P.O. Box K
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835
772-7551

LOST RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
P.O. Box 417
Mackay, Idaho 83251
588-3311

NORTHERN LIGHTS, INC.
P.O. Box 310
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864
263-5141

PRAIRIE POWER CO-OP, INC.
Box 187
Fairfield, Idaho 83327
764-2214

RAFT RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
Box 617
Malta, Idaho 83342
645-2211

RURAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. Box 647
Rupert, Idaho 83350
436-4781

SALMON RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP
P.O. Box 384
Challis, Idaho 83226
879-2283

SNAKE RIVER POWER ASSN., INC.
P.O. Box 617
Malta, Idaho 83342
645-2211

SOUTH SIDE ELECTRIC LINES
P.O. Box 142
Declo, Idaho 83323
654-2313

NOTE: The Idaho Public Utilities Commission does not regulate cooperative or municipal telephone or electric utilities; however, they are listed as a courtesy.

MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITIES
OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

ALBION LIGHT & WATER PLANT
P.O. Box 163
Albion, Idaho 83311
673-5351

BONNERS FERRY LIGHT & WATER
P.O. Box 149
Bonners Ferry, Idaho 83805
267-3105

BURLEY MUNI. DISTRIB. SYSTEM
P.O. Box 1090, 2020 Park Ave.
Burley, Idaho 83318
678-2538

DECLO MUNIC ELECTRIC DEPT.
P.O. Box 141
Declo, Idaho 83323
654-6391

DUBOIS ELECTRIC SYSTEM
Box 27
Dubois, Idaho 83423
374-5241

HEYBURN ELECTRIC DEPT.
941 18th Street, Box 147
Heyburn, Idaho 83336
678-8158

IDAHO FALLS ELECTRIC LIGHT DI
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402
529-1430

MINIDOKA ELECTRIC DEPT.
Minidoka, Idaho 83343
531-4101

PLUMMER ELECTRIC DEPT.
Plummer, Idaho 83851
686-1422

RUPERT ELECTRICAL DEPT. (CITY)
P.O. Box 426
Rupert, Idaho 83350
436-9608

SODA SPRINGS MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC
LIGHT AND POWER DEPT.
9 West 2nd South
Soda Springs, Idaho 83276
547-2151

WEISER WATER & LIGHT DEPT.
55 West Idaho Street
Weiser, Idaho 83672
549-1965

WORLEY ELECTRIC DEPT.
Worley, Idaho 83876
686-1258

SOURCE: ELECTRICAL WORLD Directory of Electric Utilities, 1982-1983, 91st Edition

TELEPHONE COOPERATIVES
OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

CUSTER TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC. P.O. Box 324 Challis, Idaho 83226	879-2281 Clarence Leuzinger
FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY, LTD. P.O. Box 346 Fruitland, Idaho 83619	452-4241 Bill Watkins
FILER MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY P.O. Box 89, 405 Main St. Filer, Idaho 83328	326-4331 John Gunn
MUD LAKE TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE P.O. Box 235 Dubois, Idaho 83423	374-5401 H.E. Kator
PROJECT MUTUAL TELEPHONE COOP. ASSOCATION, INC. ASSOC., INC. P.O. Box 366 Rupert, Idaho 83350	436-3131 Jeff Adams

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

P.O. Box 3621
1002 N.E. Holladay Street
Portland, Oregon 97208
(503) 230-3000

Walla Walla Area Office

West 101 Poplar
Walla Walla, Washington 99362
(509) 414-5500

Idaho Falls Area Office

531 Lomax - P.O. Box 255
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401
(208) 523-2706

Boise Area Office

Fred Rettenmund
Owyhee Plaza, Suite 245
1109 Main Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
(208) 334-9137

NORTHWEST POWER PLANNING COUNCIL

700 S.W. Taylor Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 222-5161

TOLL FREE - 1-800-222-3355

Boise Area Office

450 West State Street
Statehouse
Boise, Idaho 83720
(208) 334-2956

APPENDIX

COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC & GAS RATES

WITHIN THE STATE OF IDAHO

As of April 15, 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Name of Company	Page
Citizens Utilities Company	1
Idaho Power Company	3
Pacific Power & Light Company	5
Washington Water Power Company	7
Utah Power and Light Company	9
Average Billings - 500 Kwh/Mo.	11
Average Billings - 1000 Kwh/Mo.	13
Average Billings - All Electric	15
Intermountain Gas Company	17
Washington Water Power Company - Gas	19

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
3-1-41	$ 10.18	$ 16.93	$ 30.43
3-1-55	8.36	13.61	25.61
7-1-55	7.85	12.85	24.85
7-1-60	8.85	13.68	26.52
2-4-74	9.48	14.10	27.36
8-1-76	10.27	15.68	30.51
11-1-76	10.55	18.05	33.05
12-18-77	11.23	19.43	35.82
7-1-78	11.71	20.24	37.30
3-4-80	12.54	22.29	41.78
3-22-81	14.56	26.33	49.86
3-13-82	15.88	28.96	53.71
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
3-1-41	2.036 ¢	1.693 ¢	1.521 ¢
3-1-55	1.672	1.361	1.281
7-1-55	1.570	1.285	1.243
7-1-60	1.770	1.368	1.326
2-4-74	1.896	1.410	1.368
8-1-76	2.054	1.568	1.526
11-1-76	2.110	1.805	1.653
12-18-77	2.246	1.943	1.791
7-1-78	2.342	2.024	1.865
3-4-80	2.508	2.229	2.089
3-22-81	2.912	2.633	2.493
3-13-82	3.176	2.896	2.686

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
3-9-83	$ 17.81	$ 32.76	$ 62.66
3-18-84	19.78	36.69	70.52
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
3-9-83	3.562 ¢	3.276 ¢	3.133 ¢
3-18-84	3.956	3.669	3.526

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
3-21-51	$ 9.75	$ 12.35	$ 27.35
9-22-52	11.35	14.15	31.64
1-2-63	11.41	15.18	31.48
1-25-71	11.55	16.36	28.46
12-2-74	11.66	17.02	30.22
1-28-76	13.42	19.56	34.96
4-22-77	14.37	20.95	37.44
2-24-78	12.68	21.85	40.20
3-23-79	14.49	24.97	45.94
3-28-80	18.25	31.46	57.88
10-1-81	12.00	26.00	60.85
11-2-81	13.80	29.90	70.40
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
3-21-51	1.950 ¢	1.235 ¢	1.368 ¢
9-22-52	2.270	1.415	1.581
1-2-63	2.282	1.518	1.574
1-25-71	2.310	1.636	1.423
12-2-74	2.332	1.702	1.511
1-28-76	2.684	1.956	1.748
4-22-77	2.874	2.095	1.872
2-24-78	2.536	2.185	2.010
3-23-79	2.898	2.497	2.297
3-28-80	3.650	3.146	2.894
10-1-81	2.400	2.600	3.043
11-2-81	2.760	2.990	3.520

IDAHO POWER COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
		Average Monthly Billing		
12-2-81	$ 11.57	$ 25.45	$ 61.50	BPA Credit
2-9-82	12.53	27.58	65.91	
8-25-82	17.23	34.45	68.91	
2-8-83	17.93	35.86	71.72	
		Relative Cost per Kwh		
12-2-81	2.314 ¢	2.545 ¢	3.075 ¢	
2-9-82	2.506	2.758	3.296	
8-25-82	3.445	3.445	3.445	
2-8-83	3.586	3.586	3.586	

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
		Average Monthly Billing		
7-9-58	$ 8.10	$ 12.70	$ 24.70	
12-19-74	9.21	15.10	29.60	
8-3-76	9.99	16.67	32.77	
8-1-78	11.19	20.37	38.75	
3-4-80	11.87	21.75	41.50	
3-22-81	13.21	24.42	46.84	
10-1-81	12.65	23.30	44.60	BPA Credit
3-4-82	10.83	25.78	54.94	
10-1-82	15.60	31.20	62.40	
1-1-83	17.55	35.09	70.18	
3-7-83	19.31	38.61	77.22	
7-1-83	18.96	37.92	75.84	
		Relative Cost per Kwh		
7-9-58	1.620 ¢	1.270 ¢	1.235 ¢	
12-19-74	1.842	1.510	1.470	
8-3-76	1.998	1.667	1.639	
8-1-78	2.238	2.037	1.938	
3-4-80	2.374	2.175	2.075	
3-22-81	2.642	2.442	2.342	
10-1-81	2.530	2.330	2.223	
3-4-82	2.166	2.578	2.747	
10-1-82	3.120	3.120	3.120	
1-1-83	3.509	3.509	3.509	
3-7-83	3.861	3.861	3.861	
7-1-83	3.792	3.792	3.792	

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
(cont'd)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-1-83	$ 20.63	$ 41.26	$ 82.52
1-26-84	22.32	44.64	89.28
3-19-84	22.55	45.09	90.18
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
1-1-83	4.126 ¢	4.126 ¢	4.126 ¢
1-26-84	4.464	4.464	4.464
3-19-84	4.509	4.509	4.509

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
2-14-53	$ 6.71	$ 11.51	$ 23.51
6-11-56	8.01	12.42	24.65
5-6-60	8.70	12.90	24.90
4-25-67	8.45	12.62	24.45
5-26-69	8.20	12.54	22.86
9-24-70	7.85	12.35	20.60
9-13-73	7.90	12.45	20.80
11-13-74	8.24	13.39	23.02
8-12-75	7.85	13.20	23.90
11-27-76	8.30	14.00	25.40
4-15-78	9.34	16.07	29.54
10-17-79	9.98	17.15	33.32
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
2-14-53	1.341 ¢	1.151 ¢	1.175 ¢
6-11-56	1.601	1.242	1.233
5-6-60	1.740	1.290	1.245
4-25-67	1.690	1.267	1.225
5-26-69	1.640	1.254	1.143
9-24-70	1.570	1.235	1.030
9-13-73	1.580	1.245	1.040
11-13-74	1.648	1.339	1.151
9-12-75	1.570	1.320	1.195
11-17-76	1.660	1.400	1.270
4-15-78	1.868	1.607	1.477
10-17-79	1.996	1.715	1.666

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
		Average Monthly Billing		
8-11-80	$ 10.30	$ 19.00	$ 40.06	
12-1-80	10.60	19.68	41.63	
10-23-81	10.00	22.36	52.47	
11-13-81	9.00	20.35	48.45	BPA Credit
1-18-82	9.00	20.35	48.45	
10-1-82	10.14	22.67	52.30	
11-1-82	10.34	23.06	53.23	
1-31-83	10.38	23.14	53.39	
2-9-84	14.45	31.28	70.44	
3-30-84	14.58	31.55	70.97	
		Relative Cost per Kwh		
10-17-79	1.996 ¢	1.715 ¢	1.666 ¢	
8-11-80	2.060	1.900	2.003	
12-1-80	2.120	1.968	2.082	
10-23-81	2.000	2.236	2.624	
11-13-81	1.800	2.035	2.423	
1-18-82	1.800	2.035	2.423	
10-1-82	2.028	2.267	2.615	
11-1-82	2.067	2.306	2.662	
1-31-83	2.075	2.314	2.670	
2-9-84	2.889	3.128	3.522	
3-30-84	2.915	3.155	3.549	

UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-13-44	$ 10.10	$ 14.60	$ 29.60
9-7-58	10.86	15.61	31.61
8-1-64	11.36	16.36	23.26
1-1-69	11.82	17.04	25.55
5-14-72	12.29	17.72	27.76
1-20-75	14.98	21.58	33.82
5-1-75	16.49	23.74	32.71
1-1-76	18.95	27.30	42.79
5-1-76	19.70	30.48	49.19
10-3-77	15.68	32.95	57.50
3-21-78	20.35	36.70	57.85
1-1-79	23.18	41.81	65.77
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
11-13-44	2.020 ¢	1.460 ¢	1.480 ¢
9-7-58	2.172	1.561	1.581
8-1-64	2.272	1.636	1.163
1-1-69	2.365	1.704	1.278
5-14-72	2.458	1.772	1.388
1-20-75	2.996	2.158	1.691
5-1-75	3.296	2.374	1.861
1-1-76	3.790	2.730	2.140
5-1-76	3.940	3.048	2.460
10-3-77	3.136	3.295	2.875
3-21-78	4.070	3.670	2.893
1-1-79	4.636	4.181	3.289

UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
		Average Monthly Billing		
6-15-79	$ 27.67	$ 49.91	$ 78.65	
4-1-80	33.88	62.33	99.11	
5-27-81	33.20	66.40	109.33	
10-3-81	34.37	68.73	113.16	
10-3-81	24.84	49.67	75.04	BPA Credit
10-1-82	29.99	59.98	91.55	
11-18-82	30.19	60.38	92.20	
		Relative Cost per Kwh		
6-15-79	5.534 ¢	4.991 ¢	3.933 ¢	
4-1-80	6.776	6.233	4.955	
5-27-81	6.6398	6.6398	5.4665	
10-3-81	6.8732	6.8732	5.6582	
10-3-81	4.968	4.967	3.752	
10-1-82	5.998	5.998	4.577	
11-18-82	6.038	6.038	4.610	

Straight Residential Service

Average Billings - 500 Kwh Per Month

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company	Utah Power & Light Co.
3-1-41	$ 10.18				
11-13-44					$ 10.10
3-21-51		$ 9.75			
9-22-52		11.35			
2-14-53				$ 6.71	
3-1-55	8.36				
7-1-55	7.85				
6-11-56				8.01	
7-9-58			$ 8.10		
9-7-58					10.86
5-6-60				8.70	
7-1-60	8.85				
1-2-63		11.41			
8-1-64					11.36
4-25-67				8.45	
5-26-69				8.20	
9-24-70				7.85	
1-25-71		11.55			
5-14-72					12.29
9-13-73				7.90	
2-4-74	9.48				
11-13-74				8.24	
12-2-74		11.66			
12-19-74			9.21		
1-20-75					14.98
5-1-75					16.48
8-12-75				7.85	
1-1-76					18.95
1-28-76		13.42			
5-1-76					19.70
8-1-76	10.27				
8-3-76			9.99		
11-1-77	10.55				
11-27-76				8.30	
4-22-77		14.37			
10-3-77					15.68
12-18-77	11.23				
2-24-78		12.68			
3-21-78					20.35
4-15-78				9.34	
7-1-78	11.71				
8-1-78			11.19		
1-1-79					23.18
3-23-79		14.49			
6-15-79					27.67

Average Billings - 500 Kwh Per Month
(cont'd.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company	Utah Power & Light Co.
10-17-79				$ 9.98	
3-4-80	$ 12.54		$ 11.87		
3-28-80		$ 18.25			
4-1-80					$ 33.88
8-11-80				$ 10.30	
12-1-80				10.60	
3-22-81	14.56				
3-25-81			13.21		
5-27-81					33.20
10-1-81		12.00	12.65		
10-3-81					34.37
10-3-81					24.84
10-23-81				10.00	
11-2-81		13.80			
11-13-81				9.00	
12-2-81		11.57			
2-9-82		12.53			
3-4-82			10.83		
3-13-82	15.88				
8-25-82		17.23			
10-1-82			15.60	10.14	29.99
11-1-82				10.34	
11-18-82					30.19
1-1-83			17.55		
1-31-83				10.38	
2-8-83		17.93			
3-7-83			19.31		
3-9-83	17.81				
7-1-83			18.96		
11-1-83			20.63		
1-26-84			22.32		
2-9-84				14.45	
3-18-84	19.78				
3-19-84			22.55		
3-30-84				14.58	

Residential Service With Water Heating

Average Billings - 1000 Kwh Per Month

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company	Utah Power & Light Co.
3-1-41	$ 16.93				
11-13-44					$ 14.60
3-21-51		$ 12.35			
9-22-52		14.15			
2-24-53				$ 11.51	
3-1-55	13.61				
7-1-55	12.85				
7-9-58			$ 12.70		
9-7-58					15.61
5-6-60				12.90	
1-2-63		15.18			
8-1-64					16.36
9-24-70				12.35	
1-25-71		16.36			
5-14-72					17.72
9-13-73				12.45	
2-4-74	14.10				
11-13-74				13.39	
12-2-74		17.02			
12-19-74			15.10		
1-20-75					21.58
5-1-75					23.74
8-12-75				13.20	
1-1-76					27.30
1-28-76		19.56			
5-1-76					30.48
8-1-76	15.68				
8-3-76			16.67		
11-1-76	18.05				
11-27-76				14.00	
4-22-77		20.95			
10-3-77					32.95
12-18-77	19.43				
2-24-78		21.85			
3-21-78					36.70
4-15-78			16.07		
7-1-78	20.24				
8-1-78			20.37		
1-1-79					41.81
3-23-79		24.97			
6-15-79					49.91

Average Billings - 1000 Kwh Per Month
(cont'd.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company	Utah Power & Light Co.
10-17-79				$ 17.15	
3-4-80	$ 22.29		$ 21.25		
3-28-80		$ 31.46			
4-1-80					$ 62.33
8-11-80				19.00	
12-1-80				19.68	
3-22-81	26.33				
3-25-81			24.42		
5-27-81					66.40
10-1-81		26.00	23.30		
10-3-81					68.73
10-3-81					49.67
10-23-81				22.36	
11-2-81		29.90			
11-13-81				20.35	
12-2-81		25.45			
2-9-82		27.58			
3-4-82			25.78		
3-13-82	28.96				
8-25-82		34.45			
10-1-82			31.20	22.67	59.98
11-1-82				23.06	
11-18-82					60.38
1-1-83			35.09		
1-31-83				23.14	
2-8-83		35.86			
3-7-83			38.61		
3-9-83	32.76				
7-1-83			37.92		
11-1-83			41.26		
1-26-84			44.64		
2-9-84				31.28	
3-18-84	36.69				
3-19-84			45.09		
3-30-84				31.55	

All-Electric Residential Service

Average Bills - 1000 Kwh (6 Mos.) & 3000 Kwh (6 Mos.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company	Utah Power & Light Co.
3-1-41	$ 30.43				
11-13-44					$ 29.60
3-21-54		$ 27.35			
9-22-52		31.64			
2-14-53				$ 23.51	
3-1-55	25.61				
7-1-55	24.85				
7-9-58			$ 24.70		
9-7-58					31.61
5-6-60				24.90	
1-2-63		31.48			
8-1-64					23.26
1-1-69					25.55
9-24-70				20.60	
1-25-71		28.46			
5-14-72					27.76
9-13-73				20.80	
2-4-74	27.36				
11-13-74				23.02	
12-2-74		30.22			
12-19-74			29.60		
1-20-75					33.82
5-1-75					37.21
8-12-75				23.90	
1-1-76					42.79
1-28-76		34.96			
5-1-76					49.19
8-1-76	30.51				
8-3-76			32.77		
11-1-76	33.05				
11-27-76				25.40	
4-22-77		37.44			
10-3-77					57.50
12-18-77	35.82				
2-24-78		40.20			
3-21-78					57.85
4-15-78				29.54	
7-1-78	37.30				
8-1-78			38.75		
1-1-79					65.77
3-23-79		45.94			
6-15-79					78.65

Average Bills - 1000 Kwh (6 Mos.) & 3000 Kwh (6 Mos.)
(cont'd.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company	Utah Power & Light Co.
10-17-79				$ 33.32	
3-4-80	$ 41.78		$ 41.50		
3-28-80		$ 57.88			
4-1-80					$ 99.11
8-11-80				40.06	
12-1-80				41.63	
3-22-81	49.86				
3-25-81			46.84		
5-27-81					109.33
10-1-81		60.85	44.60		
10-3-81					113.16
10-3-81					75.04
10-23-81				52.47	
11-2-81		70.40			
11-13-81				48.45	
12-2-81		61.50			
2-9-82		65.91			
3-4-82			54.94		
3-13-82	53.71				
8-25-82		68.91			
10-1-82			62.40	52.30	91.55
11-1-82				53.23	
11-18-82					92.20
1-1-83			70.18		
1-31-83				53.39	
2-8-83		71.72			
3-7-83			77.22		
3-9-83	62.66				
7-1-83			75.84		
11-1-83			82.52		
1-26-84			89.28		
2-9-84				70.44	
3-18-84	70.52				
3-19-84			90.18		
3-30-84				70.97	

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-20-69	$ 2.31	$ 5.18	$ 12.80
1-1-71	2.65	5.65	13.75
4-15-71	2.75	5.95	14.65
8-11-72	2.95	6.39	15.69
4-15-73	2.97	6.46	15.90
10-19-73	3.02	6.59	16.29
11-25-73	3.02	6.61	16.35
1-1-74	3.19	7.11	17.85
4-1-74	3.23	7.23	18.21
7-23-74	3.59	7.97	19.31
12-1-74	3.84	8.74	21.62
4-1-75	3.90	8.91	22.14
8-5-75	4.17	9.71	24.53
11-1-75	4.16	9.98	25.35
10-20-76	4.90	11.77	30.50
4-1-77	4.74	11.30	29.10
10-2-77	4.95	11.94	31.00
12-19-77	4.97	11.25	30.01
4-12-78	5.10	11.61	31.15
		Relative Cost per Therm	
11-20-69	23.1 ¢	17.3 ¢	14.2 ¢
1-1-71	26.5	18.8	15.3
4-15-71	27.5	19.8	16.3
8-11-72	29.5	21.3	17.4
4-15-73	29.7	21.5	17.7
10-19-73	30.2	22.0	18.1
11-25-73	30.2	22.0	18.2
1-1-74	31.9	23.7	19.8
4-1-74	32.3	24.1	20.2
7-23-74	35.9	26.6	21.4
[illegible]-74	38.4	29.6	24.0
4-1-75	39.0	29.7	24.0
8-5-75	41.7	32.4	27.3
11-1-75	42.6	33.3	28.2
10-20-76	49.0	39.2	33.9
4-1-77	47.4	37.7	32.3
10-2-77	49.6	39.8	34.4
12-19-77	49.7	37.5	33.3
4-12-78	51.0	38.7	34.6

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
9-20-78	$ 5.26	$ 11.97	$ 32.10
10-1-78	5.27	12.22	33.06
11-15-79	6.44	15.56	42.92
1-1-80	6.43	15.63	43.23
4-1-80	6.43	17.91	50.63
10-1-80	6.10	16.98	47.18
11-1-80	7.90	19.71	49.00
4-1-81	7.85	19.56	48.56
10-1-81	8.50	21.52	54.44
12-12-81	8.92	22.76	58.14
2-16-82	9.25	22.75	58.14
10-1-82	9.49	23.48	60.32
11-1-82	10.21	25.64	65.79
12-1-82	10.10	25.51	64.74
4-1-83	9.99	24.96	63.75
4-30-83	9.77	24.30	61.77
10-1-83	9.58	23.74	60.11
4-1-84	9.96	24.88	63.50
		Relative Cost per Therm	
9-20-78	52.6 ¢	39.9 ¢	35.7 ¢
10-1-78	52.7	40.7	36.7
11-15-79	64.4	51.9	47.7
1-1-80	64.3	52.1	48.0
4-1-80	64.3	59.7	56.3
10-1-80	61.0	56.6	52.4
11-1-80	79.0	65.7	54.4
4-1-81	78.5	65.2	54.0
10-1-81	85.0	71.7	60.5
12-12-81	89.2	75.9	64.6
2-16-82	92.5	75.8	64.6
10-1-82	94.9	78.3	67.02
11-12-82	102.1	85.5	73.1
12-1-82	101.0	85.0	71.9
4-1-83	99.9	83.2	70.8
4-30-83	97.7	81.0	68.6
10-1-83	95.8	79.1	66.8
4-1-84	99.6	82.9	70.6

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

Gas

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
	Average Monthly Billing		
8-10-58	$ 3.05	$ 6.05	$ 12.53
3-26-59	2.25	6.15	12.63
4-24-64	1.50	4.50	12.43
5-10-67	1.45	4.35	12.10
3-31-71	1.48	4.44	12.40
11-1-71	1.54	4.62	12.89
4-15-73	1.57	4.71	13.21
10-1-73	1.59	4.77	13.41
1-1-74	1.76	5.29	14.89
4-1-74	1.81	5.43	15.34
12-6-74	2.08	6.24	17.82
8-13-75	4.20	7.60	17.80
1-24-76	4.61	8.85	21.55
12-16-76	4.73	8.99	21.77
4-1-77	5.03	9.88	24.43
10-1-77	5.24	10.48	26.23
10-7-78	5.47	11.21	28.42
10-1-79	5.87	12.02	30.46
	Relative Cost per Therm		
8-10-58	30.50 ¢	20.17 ¢	13.92 ¢
3-26-59	22.50	20.50	14.03
4-24-64	15.00	15.00	13.81
5-10-67	14.50	14.50	13.44
3-31-71	14.80	14.80	13.78
11-1-71	15.35	15.35	14.32
4-15-72	15.70	15.70	14.68
10-1-73	15.90	15.90	14.90
1-1-74	17.58	17.58	16.54
4-1-74	18.07	18.07	17.04
12-6-74	20.83	20.83	19.80
8-13-75	42.00	25.35	19.78
1-24-76	46.10	29.50	23.94
12-16-76	47.30	29.97	24.19
4-1-77	50.30	32.93	27.14
10-1-77	52.40	34.93	29.14
10-7-78	54.70	37.37	31.58
10-1-79	58.70	40.07	33.84

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY - GAS
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
4-1-80	$ 6.68	$ 14.43	$ 37.70
8-11-80	6.76	14.67	38.40
10-1-80	7.28	16.25	43.16
12-1-80	7.30	16.30	43.31
4-1-81	7.22	16.05	42.54
10-1-81	7.89	18.08	48.64
10-23-81	8.14	18.82	50.86
1-18-82	8.14	18.82	50.86
10-1-82	8.66	19.98	53.94
11-1-82	9.03	21.08	57.23
12-1-82	8.91	20.72	56.15
1-31-83	8.91	20.73	56.19
4-1-83	8.80	20.39	55.16
4-13-83	8.57	19.71	53.13
10-1-83	8.32	18.97	50.90
4-1-84	8.70	20.12	54.36
		Relative Cost per Therm	
4-1-80	66.80 ¢	48.10 ¢	41.89 ¢
8-11-80	67.55	48.90	42.67
10-1-80	72.80	54.17	47.96
12-1-80	73.00	54.33	48.12
4-1-81	72.20	53.50	47.27
10-1-81	78.90	60.27	54.05
10-23-81	81.40	62.73	56.51
1-18-82	81.40	62.73	56.51
10-1-82	86.60	66.60	59.93
11-1-82	90.30	70.25	63.59
12-1-82	89.06	69.07	62.39
1-31-83	89.10	69.10	62.43
4-1-83	88.00	67.97	61.29
4-13-83	85.70	65.70	59.03
10-1-83	83.20	63.23	56.56
4-1-84	87.00	67.07	60.40

S2290-1

1984 ANNUAL REPORT

THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Written and Edited by Dana Howard
Proofreading by Marjorie Maxwell
Information and assistance provided by the IPUC's Accounting and Finance, Consumer Assistance, Legal, Rates and Engineering and Regulated Carrier Divisions

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
472 WEST WASHINGTON STREET
BOISE, IDAHO 83702

MAILING ADDRESS:
STATEHOUSE
BOISE, IDAHO 83720

(208) 334-3143

Commission Secretary	334-3172
Public Information	334-3415
Consumer Assistance	334-2178
Dir. Accounting & Finance Div.	334-3466
Dir. Rates & Engineering Div.	334-3768
Dir. Legal Division	334-3248
Dir. Regulated Carrier Div.	334-3092
Dir. Consumer Assistance Div.	334-3105

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1-3
Overview of IPUC	5
Commissioners	7
Organization of IPUC & Staff	9-11
Financial Summary	13
Idaho Power Co.	15-17
Washington Water Power Co.	19-23
Utah Power and Light Co.	25-26
Citizens Utilities Co.	27
Pacific Power and Light Co.	29
Construction Work in Progress	31
Streamflow Normalization	33-34
Swan Falls	35-36
Cogeneration	37-38
Intermountain Gas	39-40
Telecommunications	41-42
Mountain Bell	43-45
General Telephone	47-49
Continental Telephone	51-52
AT&T Communications	53-54
Other telephone companies	55-56
Other telephone issues	57
Access Charges	59-60
Water Issues	61
Regulated Carrier	63-64
Consumer Issues	65-71
Utilities serving Idaho communities	73-76
Listing of all Idaho utilities	77-89
Historical rate comparisons	91-112

INTRODUCTION

In 1984, the Idaho Public Utilities Commission focused on the aftermath of the AT&T Divestiture and a massive federal effort to deregulate much of the telephone industry.

The struggle to hold costs down for local telephone service by fairly distributing costs between long-distance and basic service continued to be one of the most complex and difficult issues the Commission had ever faced.

In the electric utility arena, there were large new thermal power plant additions on the Washington Water Power system and a major challenge to the cogeneration and small power program by Idaho Power Co. In addition, Pacific Power and Light's rates continued to increase because of a PP&L-WWP wholesale power contract phase-out the IPUC had opposed, and Utah Power and Light Co. applied for higher rates to cover the cost of its new Hunter No. 3 coal-fired plant.

Rate cases continued to become more technical during 1984. Computer modeling, used increasingly by electric and telephone utilities to justify rate increases, was analyzed with increasing expertise by the IPUC staff. And as the telephone industry broke up, the Commission found itself immersed in complex questions that involved how the multitude of common costs should be divided among long-distance and local companies and among a plethora of telecommunications services.

The paperwork and requests for detailed information from utilities increased greatly.

In addition, more groups and businesses began participating in Commission proceedings.

Consumer groups, which once focused on electric rate issues, began challenging telephone rate increase requests and took an interest in rate design issues, such as measured service and rural phone charges.

Electric and telephone utilities no longer routinely confined their efforts to IPUC proceedings directly affecting their own rates and policies; they began formally participating in many cases before the Commission, especially when they involved

telephone cost-of-service and regional electric issues.

Testimony and paperwork for a rate case that once required only a single file began to take up two file cabinet drawers.

In 1984, the IPUC began an eight-month-long evaluation of available office automation equipment, and in June 1984 began converting to computerized word processing. The move resulted in increased efficiencies. Information could be processed and made available to the public more quickly than ever.

The IPUC operated with one fewer employee in FY 1984 and that level will remain steady through FY 1985, with a proposed decrease of another employee in FY 1986. A four-year build up of unspent utility assessments resulted in the Commission's decision in late 1984 to return some $300,000 to the utilities and their customers.

The Commission operated with a total work force of 53 in FY 1984 (not counting the three commissioners and the five deputy attorneys general): 23 rate analysts, engineers and auditors, 11 personnel in the Regulated Carrier Division, and 19 in the Administrative Division.

In FY 1984, the Commission handled 85 formal utility cases - 35 of them requests for rate increases. The Accounting and Finance Division conducted 23 audits of utility books during this time, during the course of its rate cases.

In addition, the Regulated Carrier Division during the same time processed and analyzed 195 applications for transport authority within Idaho, 6,305 applications for private carrier permits and 9,033 applications for interstate transport authority. The Commission conducted 36 formal hearings on regulated carrier items, and issued 267 formal orders, not counting the numerous public notices.

The Commission continued its policy of holding public hearings in the communities served by the utility seeking the rate increase or policy change. For this reason, the three commissioners and IPUC staffers spent much of their time on the road, holding public hearings everywhere from high school gymnasiums to senior centers to conventions centers and universities throughout the state. Hearing examiners were used infrequently.

Another priority of the Commission was to keep the public informed of as many utility and transportation issues, hearings and decisions as possible, in the clearest possible language.

During 1984, the IPUC issued 155 news releases and delivered many other notifications to cities, chambers and community organizations.

OVERVIEW

The Public Utilities Commission of Idaho was established by the 12th Session of the Idaho Legislature and was organized May 8, 1913. In 1951, the Commission was reorganized and its name was changed to the Idaho Public Utilities Commission. The primary responsibility of the IPUC, as outlined by the Idaho Code, is to set just and reasonable utility and common carrier rates and insure adequate services, while at the same time giving the regulated companies an opportunity to earn a fair rate of return.

By law, the Commission regulates investor-owned utilities and the intrastate operations of the transportation industry. The Commission's jurisdiction includes five electric utilities, 15 local telephone companies, one long-distance company, two natural gas companies, 24 water companies, six railroads, about 500 intrastate common carriers and thousands of interstate and private motor carriers.

As an independent regulatory body created by the Legislature, the Commission has quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial and quasi-enforcement powers. For example, in its quasi-legislative capacity, the Commission sets the rules governing utility operations and must decide contested issues, such as whether a rate increase is justified. In its quasi-judicial capacity, the Commission hears customer complaints. Finally, the Commission enforces state law affecting utilities and motor carriers.

The three members of the IPUC are appointed by the Governor and are confirmed by the Idaho Senate. They serve staggered six-year terms. If a vacancy occurs when the Senate is not in session, the Governor may appoint a replacement subject to later Senate approval. No more than two of the commissioners may be of the same political party.

To help insure that Commission decisions are fair and workable, it maintains a staff of engineers, rate analysts, attorneys, accountants, investigators, economists and other support personnel. The staff analyses each rate increase request, each application for an operating certificate and each complaint. The staff presents recommendations on these and other matters to the Commission. The IPUC considers staff recommendations along with others it receives from participating industry, agricultural, business and consumer groups, from the public and from the utilities it regulates.

The IPUC regularly conducts hearings on utility and transportation issues, usually in the service area of the utility it is considering, to allow for maximum public participation. The hearings are always open to the public.

THE COMMISSIONERS

Conley Ward, Jr was appointed to the IPUC in April 1977 by Gov. John V. Evans, and for a second term in April 1983. He served as Commission President from February 1979 to November 1980 and began his second term as President in April 1983. He is an attorney holding a J.D. degree from the University of Colorado School of Law and a B.A. degree from Columbia University. He was a Deputy Attorney General at the IPUC and was in private practice prior to his appointment to the Commission. Ward is a Democrat whose term expires in 1989.

Perry Swisher was appointed to the Commission in March 1979 by Governor Evans and was reappointed in February 1985 for a second term. He served as Commission President from November 1980 to April 1983. Swisher served as an Idaho legislator for several terms in addition to his many years in the newspaper business and other private enterprise. Swisher was Chairman of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee on Taxation in 1977-78. He sits on the Idaho Advisory Council to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. He is a Democrat whose term expires in 1991.

Richard S. High was appointed to the Commission by Gov. Evans in March 1981. He served for 14 years in the Idaho Senate, chairing the Senate Finance Committee for 10 years and the Senate Judiciary Committee for two years. High is an engineer with 27 years of farm development and management experience. He is a Republican whose term expires in 1987.

ORGANIZATION OF THE IPUC AND ITS STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISION

The Administrative Division is responsible for coordinating overall IPUC activities. The division includes the three commissioners, the Commission Secretary, the Director of Policy and Administration, the Executive Assistant, the Fiscal Officer, Personnel Officer, Information Officer and clerical support staff.

The Commission Secretary, a post established by Idaho statute, keeps a precise public record of all Commission proceedings and meetings. The Secretary issues notices, orders and other documents to the proper parties and is the Commission's official custodian of official documents.

The Director of Policy and Administration oversees the entire workload of the IPUC and coordinates the activities of the various divisions. The Executive Assistant is primarily responsible for the fiscal operations of the Commission. The Fiscal Office oversees the budget, payroll, purchase and maintenance of materials and equipment, and personnel matters. The Information Officer is responsible for informing the public of Commission decisions, meetings and activities, responding to requests for information, coordinating public hearings and preparing materials that allow for effective public participation in IPUC proceedings.

LEGAL DIVISION

The IPUC staff is represented by five Deputy Attorneys General who are assigned to the Commission and have permanent offices at IPUC headquarters.

The IPUC staff attorneys represent the staff in all matters before the Commission, working closely with staff accountants, engineers and economists as they develop their recommendations for rate case and policy proceedings. Attorneys represent the staff in the hearing room and cross-examine other parties who submit testimony. They also represent the Commission itself in state and federal courts and in other state or federal regulatory agencies.

RATES AND ENGINEERING DIVISION

The Rates and Engineering Division is responsible for the economic and engineering analysis of utility rates and

practices. This division may analyze, for example, the cost of providing a particiular type of service and the fairness of its price. Economists may review the method the utilities use to forecast the need for new plants or the way a utility divides responsibility for costs among the several states it may serve. Engineers and economists also review the cost-effectiveness of conservation and cogeneration programs.

ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE DIVISION

The Accounting and Finance Division is responsible for auditing all utilities to determine their proper income and expenses. When utilities request rate increases, for example, IPUC staff auditors analyze company revenues, expenditures, accounting methods and cost of capital. From these studies, staff accountants recommend how much revenue the companies need to earn a fair reasonable return.

CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION

The Consumer Assistance Division is responsible for working out disputes between utilities and customers. For example, customers faced with utility disconnects often seek help from the IPUC so they can negotiate payment arrangements. Consumer Assistance may also mediate disputes over billings, deposits, line extensions and service problems.

Consumer Assistance also monitors Idaho utilities to see if they are complying with Commission orders and regulations. It also participates in general IPUC rate and policy cases when it needs to bring consumer service issues to the Commission's attention.

Most consumers contact the Commission by telephone and most disputes are resolved without requiring the consumer to file a written complaint or visit the Commission's office in Boise. Division staff members make referrals to social service agencies, financial aid programs, or budget counseling services where appropriate, and negotiate payment arrangements with utilities on behalf of consumers.

REGULATED CARRIER DIVISION

The Regulated Carrier Division is responsible for regulating private, common and contract intrastate motor carriers, and all interstate motor carriers. The division makes sure motor carriers are registered, adequately insured and comply with all safety requirements.

In addition, the IPUC has limited jurisdiction over rates charged by carriers, including railroads and bus lines. The Commission also has authority over some services offered by carriers, such as railroad station agencies.

In addition to the Division Director, tariff supervisor and staff, Regulated Carrier has four investigators based in Boise, Twin Falls, Idaho Falls and Lewiston. The four investigators are frequently on the road, inspecting carriers for proper safety equipment, proper certification and to make sure they are charging authorized rates. They also are trained to identify and supervise the clean-up of hazardous substance spills.

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Financial Summary
FY-84

July 1, 1983 - June 30, 1984

Appropriation (Dedicated Fund)	$2,618,000
Appropriation (General Fund)	135,500
TOTAL APPROPRIATION	$2,753,500
Receipts:	
Collected from Utilities	$1,803,916
Other Misc. Receipts	33,637
Motor Carrier Fees	431,568
Railroad Fees	142,939
TOTAL RECEIPTS	$2,412,058
Expenditures:	
Salaries & Fringe Benefits	$1,344,646
Travel	91,922
Professional Services	230,870
Other Services (Transcripts, Data Processing, etc.)	98,056
Communications (Postage & Telephone)	82,814
Materials and Supplies	23,228
Rentals	164,251
Repairs & Maintenance	13,782
Misc. Expenditures	1,278
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$2,050,847
Capital Outlay	46,943
GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES	$2,097,790
Unexpended Balance of Receipts Subject to Refund to Utilities	$ 314,268

(Legislature transferred $134,500 to the General Fund to pay commissioners' salaries.)

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

Idaho Power Co. is the state's largest electric utility, serving most of southern Idaho. It is based in Boise and has about 240,000 customers.

In 1984, as in 1983, Idaho Power did not seek any rate increase. Like the rest of the region's hydroelectric utilities, substantial snowpacks and high streamflows meant that Idaho Power's revenues from power sales were high enough to offset any increased expenses it had during that time.

The second unit of Idaho Power's 12.5 megawatt Cascade Dam rebuild project came on line in 1984 and Valmy II, the 250 mw Nevada coal-fired plant the utility is building with Sierra-Pacific, is scheduled for completion in mid-1985.

Idaho Power's contact with the Commission during 1984 largely involved its opposition to the rates it pays for independently-produced power, its proposed rebate program for efficient electrical appliances, and its proposal to recover expenses related to the canceled Pioneer plant.

Idaho Power's residential rate remained a constant 3.9803¢ per kilowatt hour through 1984.

IDAHO POWER COMPANY CASES:

PIONEER COST RECOVERY
CASE NO U-1006-219

December 1984, Idaho Power applied to recover $14.1 million associated with its attempt to build the Pioneer coal-fired plant - a 1,000 megawatt the utility proposed to build in the 1970s. The IPUC in 1976 had rejected Idaho Power's application to build at a site 30 miles southeast of Boise. But before the Commission's ruling, Idaho Power incurred significant engineering and design fees and had ordered equipment for the project.

In July 1984, the IPUC ruled that it would allow Idaho Power to recover $2.25 million over a nine-year period beginning in 1984, a move that would eventually boost the utility's rates by less than one-tenth of 1%. Idaho Power was allowed only various payroll and legal expenses, consulting engineers fees

and costs related to preliminary site investigations and environmental studies incurred while preparing its 1974 application to the IPUC. Recovery of engineering and design work was not permitted past January of 1975, after the first public hearing on the project, when it became apparent the utility faced some public opposition. No cancellation charges were allowed.

CANCELLATION OF INCREMENTAL COMMERCIAL RATE
CASE NO. U-1006-223

In March 1984, the IPUC canceled an Idaho Power program under which some of its major power customers could have been charged more per kilowatt hours for any new large blocks of power they needed. Since September 1981, Idaho Power's Schedule 19 customers (including owners of major office buildings, manufacturing plants, schools and hospitals) had been on notice that if their demand for electricity grew by more than 1 megawatt, power exceeding that level would cost more. None of the customers actually increased their power loads significantly and no one was ever charged the higher rate. But the Commission, at the utility's request, said that the current energy surplus meant that any new energy requirements of Schedule 19 customers would not cause the need for new utility investment.

EFFICIENT APPLIANCE REBATE PROPOSAL
CASE NO. U-1006-225

In March 1984, Idaho Power proposed giving cash rebates to customers purchasing highly efficient electrical appliances, such as heat pumps, air conditioners and water heaters. In June, the IPUC turned down the proposal, saying there were no assurances that the program would reduce energy consumption and that there was some chance it would result in increased energy demand. The program would have been an expense charged to all ratepayers.

SWAN FALLS DAM INVESTIGATION
CASE NO. U-1006-240

In August 1984, the Commission announced that it would hold hearings on Idaho Power's plan to rebuild and expand the capacity of its historic Swan Falls Dam on the Snake River. The power company said that renovations and an expansion of capacity from 12 to 25 megwatts would cost about $61 million. The IPUC wanted to know if the rebuild was a least-cost energy option, and how the price of power from the project compared to

other available sources, such as independently-produced power. Idaho Power in September requested and received permission to delay hearings on the matter; it later canceled its expansion project and said it would only refurbish the existing dam.

REFUND OF $50/KILOWATT HOOKUP FEES
CASE NO. P-300-14

In December 1984, the Commission required Idaho Power (and Washington Water Power Co.) to refund a $50 per kilowatt hookup fee that was paid in 1981 and 1982 by customers with new electric space heating as part of an IPUC-ordered conservation program. The decision was made in response to an October 1984 Idaho Supreme Court decision setting aside two earlier IPUC orders designed to discourage customers from building structures that used electricity for space heating when natural gas was available. The program began for Idaho Power customers in September 1981 but ended in May 1982 when the Idaho Supreme Court ruled in favor of a protest filed by the Idaho Homebuilders Association.

For more Idaho Power information, see: CWIP, Streamflow Normalization, Cogeneration, Swan Falls, Consumer Issues.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

Regulation of Washington Water Power Co. in 1984 was dominated by the utility's two large rate increase requests related to its investments in the newly-completed Colstrip No. 3 coal-fired plant and the Kettle Falls wood-waste plant.

Much attention also was given to WWP's 5% interest in the delayed Washington Public Power Supply System No. 3 plant. In 1984, the Commission held special public proceedings on whether or not the utility should be allowed to continue participating in the plant - one of five famous WPPSS plants that had been plagued with cost overruns.

There was tremendous public interest in these three cases. In northern Idaho, consumers were shown how dramatically new thermal plants could affect rates - particularly when the rates for years had been based on cheap hydroelectric costs. Hearing rooms were often filled to capacity.

The IPUC began in the spring of 1984 an investigation of WWP's (and Idaho Power's) so-called "streamflow normalization" methods. The Commission said it wanted to know if it could establish a system under which the state's hydroelectric utilities could draw upon their excess revenues from high water years to cover their higher power costs during droughts.

WWP, based in Spokane, Wash., serves about 56,000 customers in northern Idaho. The residential price of WWP's electricity increased from 2.314¢/kilowatt hour to 3.749¢/kwh during 1984, a substantial jump, though it remained the lowest priced private power in Idaho. Its residential natural gas rates increased less; the price of a therm of gas increased from 53.23¢/therm to 54.36¢/therm during 1984.

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CASES

RATE INCREASE APPLICATION
CASE NO. U-1008-185

In April 1983, WWP applied for a $33.8 million, 64.8% electric rate increase. Approximately $20 million of the request was related to its share in the Colstrip No. 3 plant, which was scheduled for completion in January 1983. Another $10 million of the request was related to the Kettle Falls wood-waste

plant, which was scheduled to be completed in October 1983. Public hearings were held in Moscow in August 1983 and in Coeur d'Alene in December 1983. The Commission received an unprecedented number of letters, postcards, petitions and public statements opposing the rate increase.

In February 1984, the Commission granted WWP a $14.9 million, 28.6% rate increase - a decision that gave the company less than half of its 64.8% , $33.8 million request and that said ratepayers would not be obligated to pay for any of the utility's investment in the Kettle Falls plant.

The IPUC said that even WWP's own studies showed a plant of that size and cost was not needed to meet its perceived power shortfall; the Commission called the company decision to build the $86.4 million, 42.5 megawatt plant "imprudent" and "unreasonable."

The Commission lowered the utility's return on common equity from 15.25 to 14.75%, denied a request for an inflationary adjustment and took exception to a computer model the company uses to estimate how often WWP actually requires power from its share in the Centralia coal plant during normal water years.

WWP subsequently applied for a rehearing, and after two public hearings, the Commission in June 1984 ruled that it was forced by new evidence to reverse its February decision denying Kettle Falls recovery. The company successfully argued that the Commission had misinterpreted testimony that appeared to show the utility would not be taking full advantage of its Colstrip plants and therefore was creating a false impression of the need for Kettle Falls.

The Commission said WWP could include 90% of Kettle Falls in its rate base as soon as the plant was operating. (In the meantime, the plant's air pollution control equipment had failed; the plant, which had been in operation only briefly in 1983, was restarted and approved by the Washington Department of Ecology in November 1984. A $6.6 million, 9.7% rate boost was subsequently granted.)

WPPSS NO. 3 NUCLEAR PLANT INVESTMENT
CASE NO. U-1008-204

During the course of WWP's major 1983 rate case (U-1008-185), the IPUC told WWP it must respond to questions raised by consumer group Idaho Fair Share about the $117 million the utility had committed by mid-1983 on its share in the stalled Washington Public Power Supply System No. 3 nuclear plant. By

year-end 1984, the figure was expected to grow to $155 million. Idaho's share of WWP expenses is about 35%. The Bonneville Power Administration, which has a 70% share in the plant, decided in July 1983 to delay construction for three years at the 75% complete plant. (In the wake of this BPA decision, WWP and the three other private utilities investing in the plant filed suit against the BPA.)

Public hearings were held in January, August and December of 1984. WWP officials originally said that the plant probably would be finished, that the region needed the power, and that it should be allowed to continue its participation and accumulation of interest on its investment in the plant. WWP also said, however, that it would be willing to sell its share in the plant to the BPA.

Later in the year, after BPA delayed plant construction for another two years, WWP officials asked the IPUC if it could amortize nearly $56 million (Idaho's share) of the $155 million it would have spent (plus accumulated interest) on the project by year-end 1984 - a move that would raise average rates by 10% over a 10-year period.

The case was unresolved at year-end 1984. Early in 1985, however, WWP and the three other private utilities participating in the plant reached a tentative agreement with the BPA designed to end the litigation. The agreement would end the private utilities' participation, but they would be required to buy from the BPA an amount of power equal to their share in the plant. The IPUC agreed to delay the case until it had more information about the agreement.

RATE INCREASE APPLICATION
CASE NO. U-1008-219

WWP in April 1984 applied for a $20 million, 28.6% rate increase to cover alleged increases in operating and maintenance expenses, an increase in its return on common equity from 14.75% to 15.75%, and amortization of Idaho's share in the $26.4 million it spent on the canceled Skagit/Hanford nuclear plant.

After public hearings in August and December 1984, the Commission in January 1985, granted WWP a $7.5 million, 10% rate increase - a little more than one-third of the request.

Most of the increase was related the the higher operating costs WWP had with two new power plants on line: Colstrip No. 3 and Kettle Falls.

Out of the $7.5 million total increase allowed, $571,000 was related to WWP's request to recover losses on the Skagit/Hanford nuclear plant. WWP officials had asked for $17.8 million, or $3.56 million each year in extra revenue from ratepayers over a five-year period. (The Skagit/Hanford request was about 18% of the company's application. WWP owns 10% of the project, which was canceled in 1983.)

The Commission allowed WWP to recover $8.58 million, or $521,000 per year over a 15-year period. The IPUC said it would not allow WWP to recover any expenses incurred after year-end 1981 (when the IPUC began prohibiting accumulation of AFUDC on the plant) and only half of its expenses before that time. The Commission majority said that while the company had reason to believe the power was needed when initial planning began, the proposed plant was unusually large and the participating utilities incurred substantial equipment costs before they obtained the necessary licensing.

"These competing factors and others we could list could fill many more pages of this Order. However, they cannot be weighed against one another with mathematical precision. Instead, we exercise our judgement by finding that a 50/50 sharing of pre-1982 Skagit/Hanford costs between ratepayers and shareholders is a reasonable method of allocating this economic loss between the two groups," said the Commission's final order.

Commissioner Conley Ward Jr. dissented in part from the Commission order, saying he would have limited WWP's recovery of Skagit costs from ratepayers to those incurred in the licensing process.

WWP was allowed to increase its return on common stock from 14.75% to 14.9%; but because the cost of its debt had dropped, its overall return dropped from 12.14% to 12.097%.

CABLE POLE ATTACHMENT RATES
CASE NO. U-1008-206

In December 1983, WWP petitioned the IPUC to resolve a case involving the rates several northern Idaho cable television companies were paying WWP for use of the power company's utility poles. (The 1982 Legislature designated the IPUC as the agency responsible for resolving such disputes; this was the first case of its kind to arrive at the Commission's doorstep.) The case generated a mountain of paperwork - mostly documents and

testimonies revolving around the correct method of determining the value of a utility pole. There was also some question as to how many utility poles WWP had in Idaho; the company did not know. Hearings were held in July 1984 and a decision was rendered in November 1984, when it was decided that cable television companies must pay WWP $4 per year per pole. WWP had asked for $6.92 per pole; the cable companies proposed $2.08 per pole.

BPA TRACKER INCREASE
CASE NO. U-1008-211

In February 1984, the IPUC allowed WWP a $1.14 million, 2.15% rate increase to cover a boost in the rate the utility pays the Bonneville Power Administration for transmission.

REFUND OF $50/KILOWATT HOOKUP FEES
CASE NO. P-300-14

In December 1984, the Commission required WWP (and Idaho Power Co.) to refund a $50 per kilowatt hookup fee that was paid in 1981 and 1982 by customers with new electric space heating as part of an IPUC-ordered conservation program. The decision was made in response to an October 1984 Idaho Supreme Court decision setting aside two IPUC orders designed to discourage customers from building structures that used electricity for space heating when natural gas was available. The program began for WWP customers in March 1980 but ended in May 1982 when the Idaho Supreme Court ruled in favor of a protest filed by the Idaho Homebuilders Association.

For WWP information, see CWIP, Streamflow Normalization, Cogeneration, Consumer Issues.

UTAH POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

The IPUC's regulation of Utah Power and Light Co. in 1984 was dominated by one major rate case.

The Salt Lake City-based utility serves about 45,000 customers in rural eastern Idaho. It generates most of its power at its own Utah coal-fired plants.

In December 1983, UP&L applied for a $31 million, 28% rate increase to cover the cost of its new Hunter No. 3 coal plant, its weatherization program, an increase in its return, increased expenses and a boost in Idaho's share of total company expenses.

During 1983 and 1984, UP&L slowed its construction program, deferring the Hunter No. 4 coal-fired plant and reducing its participation in the 1522 megawatt Intermountain Power Project from 25% to 4%.

Winter residential rates increased by about 10% during 1984. For example, a customer using electricity for winter heating, consuming 2,000 kilowatt hours per month saw a billing increase from $95.68 to $105.62 between January 1984 and December 1984.

Late in 1983, the three commissioners initiated talks with UP&L, the Wyoming and Utah commissions to study the utility's allocation of costs and investments among the three states it serves. The Idaho Commission said its wanted to know if strong industrial and oil and gas-related growth in Utah and Wyoming - combined with lowered demand for power from eastern Idaho irrigators - would change each state's obligation to UP&L.

UTAH POWER AND LIGHT CASES

RATE INCREASE APPLICATION
CASE NO. U-1009-137

In December 1983, UP&L applied for a $9.4 million, 9.65% rate increase in December 1983 to track through the cost of its new Hunter No. 3 coal-fired plant and its weatherization program.

Of the total request, $6.9 million was related to the Hunter plant; $2.5 million was related to weatherization loans and grants it made between October 1982 and October 1983.

Under the company's proposal, residential rates would increase overall by 11.23% after the BPA credit.

In April 1984 (in response to a motion filed by the Department of Energy's Idaho National Engineering Laboratory), UP&L expanded the scope of the proceeding by filing a general rate case that proposed a $31 million, 28% boost in average rates. The $9.4 million the company already had requested in its December application was included in the general rate case.

In May 1984, the Commission concluded the original part of the case (for a $9.4 million, 9.65% rate boost) by awarding the company an interim $4.5 million, 4.12% increase. The IPUC allowed only $3.3 million of the $6.9 million sought for the Hunter No. 3 plant, saying the company had underestimated the revenues it could expect from the facility and that it overstated the plant's startup and training costs. The $2.5 weatherization cost was allowed, but the company was ordered to take three years to recover it from ratepayers.

In June 1984, the IPUC held a public hearing at Pocatello on the rest of the company's application for a general rate boost.

Highlights of the application included UP&L's request to increase its return on common equity from 15.25 to 16% and revenue to make up for a shortfall in earnings from the level the company expected to receive after its last rate boost. It also wanted more total company costs allocated to Idaho. UP&L also proposed to end its seasonal rate program, under which residential customers pay less per kilowatt hour in the winter.

In September 1984, the IPUC granted the company an additional $9.5 million, 8.5% overall increase. For residential and irrigation customers, however, an increased energy credit from the Bonneville Power Administration offset almost all of the rate boost.

The IPUC exempted medium-sized commercial customers from the increase and did not allow the company to discontinue its lower winter rates for residents.

While the Commission recognized some of UP&L's higher operating expenses, it lowered its return on common equity from 15.25% to 14.75%, required it to credit ratepayers for Idaho's share of some $15 million in cash the company had collected as a tax cushion, and would not allow the utility to begin earning on the facilities shared by the new Hunter No. 3 plant and the delayed Hunter No. 4 plant.

An ongoing construction review program for UP&L was set up by the Commission.

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

Citizens Utilities Company of Stamford, Connecticut serves about 2,500 electric and water customers in the northern Idaho communities of Wallace, Silverton, Mullan and Burke.

The company purchases all power to serve its Idaho customers from the Washington Water Power Co.

Citizens did not apply for any rate increases during 1984.

It's last rate increase was in March 1983, when the Commission granted the company a 2.2% increase in its electric rates and a 9.2% increase in its water rates.

PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

Pacific Power and Light's Idaho customers continued to experience rate increases during 1984 - largely due to a phase-out of a longtime wholesale power supply deal PP&L had with the Washington Water Power Co.

In 1981, over the objections of the IPUC, WWP received approval from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to phase out a long-standing program though which PP&L purchased wholesale from WWP all of the power it needed to supply its Idaho customers. WWP's power generation costs are substantially lower than PP&L's (although WWP's prices are expected to rise in the wake of its large thermal plant construction program).

Under the FERC-approved plan, WWP since 1982 has been annually withdrawing 25% of its wholesale power supply to PP&L; by 1986, all of the WWP supply will be gone.

The result has been substantial rate increases for PP&L customers over which the Commission has had little control.

In 1984, the price of 1,000 kilowatt hours for residential customers increased from $41.26 to $47.69.

PP&L, a Portland, Oregon-based utility, serves 8,500 customers in the Sandpoint and Priest River areas.

CONSTRUCTION WORK IN PROGRESS

The Idaho Supreme Court on Dec. 14, 1983 issued a decision on a Utah Power and Light Co. case appeal that effectively required the IPUC to grant Construction Work in Progress funding to utilities.

Mandatory Construction Work in Progress - or CWIP - would have given Idaho utilities a return on virtually all plant investment made, regardless of whether it was in operation or would ever be completed.

The IPUC traditionally has denied CWIP funding, arguing that it shifts the risk of investment from shareholders to ratepayers, who aren't yet receiving any benefit.

But the Idaho Supreme Court majority ruled that in a 1978 Utah Power and Light Co. case, the Commission should have allowed the company to begin earning a return on its unfinished Huntington coal-fired plant, saying rates "should be adjusted for anticipated and known changes where the changes are shown to be reliable and certain."

The Commission on Jan. 5, 1984 announced that it would comply with the court's decision by ceasing the accumulation of alternative accounting measures and allowing CWIP accounts into utility rate bases - a move that would have increased electric rates in Idaho by between 4.6% and 78.2%, depending on the amount of the investment the utility had in any unfinished power plants, transmission lines or buildings. (WWP customers would have been most adversely affected, because the company had a considerable CWIP balance due to its large construction program.)

A public hearing was scheduled for Jan. 20 to hear comments on how the plan should be carried out, but the Idaho Legislature was already at work drafting legislation that would prohibit CWIP funding in Idaho. At the request of Idaho Mountain Bell, the IPUC stayed its earlier order authorizing CWIP funding; Bell argued that it was likely the Idaho Legislature would soon prohibit such funding.

The legislation passed by overwhelming margins in the Idaho House and Senate and was signed into law by Idaho Governor John Evans on Feb. 29, 1984. The new law provided: "Except upon its finding of extreme emergency, the commission is hereby prohibited in any order issued after the effective date of this act from setting rates for any utility that grants a return on construction work in progress (except short-term construction work in progress) or property held for future use and which is not currently used and useful in providing utility service."

STREAMFLOW NORMALIZATION

The Commission in December 1984 concluded an investigation of the fairest way to set rates for customers of hydroelectric utilities - companies that experience both windfall revenue years when streamflows are high and occasional cash shortfalls during droughts.

Under a proposed reporting program (which was to be finalized in early 1985), the Commission would have detailed information on hand to establish whether or not Idaho Power Co. and Washington Water Power Co. charge their customers rates that actually reflect their need for revenue.

Idaho Power and WWP generate most of their power at hydroelectric dams, which yield more electricity in the years when streamflows are high. Revenues are higher in these years because the companies do not rely as heavily on its more expensive coal-fired plants and can sell excess power to other utilities and industries. Conversely, when streamflows are below normal, the companies must often make expensive purchases from other utilities and must frequently rely on their more expensive coal-fired plants.

The Commission for a number of years has relied on computer models the utilities use to estimate their revenues and costs during "normal" years - although the models have been challenged in recent years by the IPUC staff.

Under the proposed reporting program, Idaho Power and WWP each year would answer a detailed list of questions about their actual hydroelectric generation, the power they were actually able to sell and the extent to which they relied on their more expensive coal plants. The results would be compared with those predicted by utility computer models, which now play a major role in determining the need for rate revenue.

Over the years, the Commission would accumulate very accurate information about the companies' actual fluctuating revenues.

The information could be used to offset rate increase requests, or to verify the need for higher rates, due to low streamflow years.

Originally, the Commission had thought the investigation could result in a so-called streamflow normalization account that would hold excess revenues from high water years to offset the need for surcharges in drought years. The IPUC also considered

periodic rate refunds or surcharges to even-out past inequities. But the Commission decided it needed to first set up a detailed reporting requirement so that it could accumulate a backlog of reliable information it could use in future rate cases. The Commission asked for comments from the parties in the case on any accounting or technical problems it should be aware of.

A final order was expected in early 1985.

SWAN FALLS WATER RIGHTS ISSUE

Swan Falls, Idaho's most critical water rights issue, was still unresolved at year-end 1984, although a major agreement between the State of Idaho and Idaho Power Co. was scheduled to go before the Idaho Legislature in early 1985.

The issue began receiving much public attention in November 1982 when the Idaho Supreme Court ruled on a case involving Idaho Power Company's water rights at Swan Falls Dam - the midway point on the Snake River between the utility's three massive Hell's Canyon hydroelectric dams and the upstream points from which most of the state's irrigation water is diverted.

The case originated at the IPUC in 1977 when Boise attorney Matt Mullaney, now state Senator John Peavey and 30 other Idaho residents filed a complaint with the Commission, charging that Idaho Power Co. was promoting Snake River diversions and therefore was failing to protect its water rights at Swan Falls.

The complaint suggested that less water through Swan Falls could only result in less cheap hydroelectric power from the three downstream dams; the complaint asked for ratepayer compensation.

The complaint sparked a suit in District Court, which wound its way to the Idaho Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, in November 1982 held that Idaho Power had subordinated its water rights at the Hell's Canyon dams to upstream irrigation, but that its water right at Swan Falls was not clear. The high court remanded the case to District Court to determine whether or not Idaho Power had, over the years, abandoned part of its 8,400 cfs water right at Swan Falls.

In an effort to establish its interest in preserving the water right, Idaho Power in March 1983 filed a complaint in District court against about 7,500 water users and the Idaho Department of Water Resources. The company asked the court to determine that the upstream water users' rights are subordinate to the company's rights for its Swan Falls, Bliss, Lower Salmon and Salmon hydroelectric facilities.

There were unsuccessful attempts in both the 1983 and 1984 sessions of the Idaho Legislature to pass legislation that would subordinate the production of power from Idaho water to irrigation use.

Finally, on Oct. 25, 1984, Idaho Gov. John Evans, Idaho Attorney General Jim Jones and Idaho Power Co. Chief Executive Officer James Bruce signed the so-called Swan Falls Agreement.

The agreement, which was subject to the approval of the 1985 Legislature, was an attempt to resolve the long-standing dispute over how the Snake River's water should be used, especially in future years: primarily to generate inexpensive power at Idaho Power's hydroelectric facilities, or for continued upstream irrigation development.

The agreement would increase the minimum streamflow at the dam from 3,300 cubic feet per second (in the summer, during the lowest streamflow year) to 3,900 cfs - a move that would make 600 cfs of additional flow available to Idaho Power at its huge Hells Canyon dam complex, downstream from Swan Falls.

Idaho Power soon after asked the Commission for an order that would declare the agreement in the public interest. The power company also wanted assurances that it would be protected from damages if a future Commission or court found that the agreement resulted in the abandonment of valuable Idaho Power water rights.

But the IPUC said it could not rule until the 1985 Legislature considered the agreement. The Commission noted that the legislative branch, and not a subordinate state agency, must make such crucial policy decisions.

The three commissioners' chief concern throughout the statewide debate was the Idaho Power ratepayers would be protected from power rates rising higher than they would have otherwise - whatever the outcome. The IPUC staff calculated that maximum upstream irrigation development (assuming all available water were used for farmland expansion) would result in a drain of hydroelectric resources that would create the need for a 250 mw thermal power plant that would cost Idaho Power customers an estimated $53.8 million annually (17% more than its current cost of operation).

COGENERATION AND SMALL POWER PRODUCTION

There was significant growth in the independent power industry during 1984, though there were continual legal challenges to federal and IPUC rulings requiring Idaho's private electric utilities to buy the power.

Shortly after year-end 1984, Idaho had 34 independent projects on-line and delivering power to electric utilities, producing nearly 25 megawatts of electricity. (This does not include Potlatch Corporation's 32 mw wood-waste plant in Lewiston, which so far has produced power only for its own operations in the absence of a contract with Washington Water Power Co.)

The vast majority of the projects were hydroelectric, usually small turbines built on streams and irrigation canals. At year-end 1984, there were 27 on-line hydroelectric projects producing a total of 10.5 mw. There were also three large wood-waste plants on-line and delivering to utilities by year-end, producing 14.4 mw. Finally, there were three wind projects, producing only 29 kilowatts of power.

Idaho Power Co. was buying from more on-line projects than any other utility, with 26 projects producing a total 18.33 mw. WWP was purchasing from three projects producing less than one-half of a megawatt. Utah Power and Light was purchasing 1.8 mw from three projects and Pacific Power and Light one-fifth of one megawatt from one hydroelectric project.

Idaho Power and UP&L at year-end also had contracts for the purchase of an additional 29.8 mw from among 16 projects.

In January 1984, the Idaho Supreme Court upheld a 1982 IPUC order requiring Idaho Power to sign a fixed-rate, 35-year contract for the purchase of power from a 6.5 mw wood-waste plant developed by Afton Energy, Inc.

In July 1984, however, the Court on rehearing said that such contracts should be subject to the future review of the IPUC - a move that threw a great deal of uncertainty into the fledgling industry. There was an additional legal twist in December 1984 when the Court withdrew the July opinion and said that contract rates could be changed, but only in a manner "not inconsistent with federal law," a move which the IPUC believes guarantees an unchanging contract rate for independent power developers.

During 1984, Idaho Power asked the Commission to temporarily end its requirement to buy the cogenerated power - or reduce

the rate dramatically. The Commission refused.

Congress ordered the nation's electric utilities to buy independently-produced power to give businesses, families, farmers and industries an incentive to develop available energy sources, such as waste heat from manufacturing processes or small hydroelectric energy sources in irrigation canals and streams. Congress found that it was in the national interest to develop diverse energy sources, rather than large, central plants.

In Idaho, the Commission believes that cogeneration will hold down energy costs in the long run. Independent power producers agree to deliver power for for a fixed rate, usually for 35 years. The rate is usually an average of the cost of energy from the utility's own planned power plants, discounted by the cheap, temporary supply of surplus hydroelectric energy that should be available through the end of the decade.

At year-end 1984, levelized rates for 35-year contracts were 6.5¢/kwh for Idaho Power Co., 5.5¢/kwh for WWP, 5.4¢/kwh for UP&L and 7¢/kwh for PP&L.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

Intermountain Gas Co. rates were relatively stable during 1984. While a jump in the company's wholesale gas costs caused a 7.2% average rate increase in February, it was followed by three successive wholesale price drops, which were passed through to customers. As a result, the price of 100 therms of gas for a residential customer in the winter increased only 1% between January and December 1984.

Intermountain in September 1984 was acquired by IMG Holdings, Inc., four investors who formed the corporation for the purpose of purchasing the company. The Commission had no jurisdiction over the takeover, but publicly stated that it would not allow the transaction to affect rates charged by the company.

Intermountain is based in Boise and serves approximately 97,000 customers in southern Idaho.

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS CASES

BEKER/SIMPLOT EMERGENCY CONTRACTS
CASE NO. U-1034-118

In late December 1984, Intermountain asked the IPUC to approve temporary gas contracts with Beker Industries and Simplot Co. - companies that manufacture fertilizer in eastern Idaho.

Both companies had been purchasing gas on an interruptible basis from Gas Company of New Mexico, but their supplies were cut off in the last week of December.

Intermountain agreed to furnish Simplot with 100,000 therms per day on an interruptible basis through April 15, 1985. After that time, Simplot promised to return an equal amount of gas to Intermountain over the pipeline system and pay interest on the borrowed commodity at the prime rate plus 1%. In addition, Intermountain would receive one and a half cents per therm delivered and a demand charge.

Intermountain agreed to supply Beker with 20,000 therms per day through April 15, for which Beker would pay the current rate for large volume industrial customers. After that time, Beker agreed to sell the same amount of gas back to Intermountain at 5¢ less per therm than it had paid.

The IPUC approved both contracts early in 1985.

INDUSTRIAL RATE DROP
CASE NO. U-1034-117

In November 1984, Intermountain filed an application to slightly increase its residential and commercial gas rates so it could offer more attractive prices to its large industrial customers.

Intermountain argued that rates for all ratepayers would eventually drop if it could keep its large customers and attract new businesses. The gas company lost two of its largest customers - Simplot Co. and Beker Industries - in late 1981 when they turned to Southwest suppliers with lower prices. The loss of business was one of the major reasons for the company's 1982 request for an $8.7 million, 6.4% rate increase, some of which was granted by the IPUC. The company also argued that two of its potato processing customers recently had converted to coal and that most other processors were considering that option.

Intermountain's proposal was to reduce rates for large volume customers by an average 2.21%, raise the standard residential rate by 1.39%, raise the discount residential rate by .6% and raise the commercial rate by .48%.

Public hearings were scheduled for January 1985.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Throughout 1984, the Commission was knee-deep in proceedings related to the historic AT&T divestiture and the unprecedented federal effort to change the way telephone services in this country are financially supported.

AT&T on Jan. 1, 1984, was divested of its 22 Bell operating companies - the companies that provide local telephone service. In the agreement struck between the U.S. Justice Department and AT&T, AT&T was allowed to keep its long-distance business between states. And, to further complicate matters, AT&T also was allowed to offer long-distance between large geographic areas within states called LATAs (Local Access Transport Areas).

AT&T also was allowed to keep all in-place telephone equipment and to sell new phone equipment.

As the once relatively integrated telephone industry was divided into many competing interests, the biggest problem involved how to decide who's responsible for the many costs they all shared.

For instance, the now-separate long-distance and local telephone companies still need to share many expensive facilities. When a customer places a long-distance call, for example, local telephone exchanges are needed on both ends of the call, in addition to the long-distance line that connects them. Long-distance companies, therefore, have been required to pay for their share of local costs.

AT&T, faced with new and growing competition from the new long-distance companies and backed by a Federal Communications Commission anxious to deregulate the telecommunications industry, argued that long-distance companies should be responsible only for facilities used exclusively for long-distance. The common costs shifted away from long-distance companies, they argued, should be paid directly by the customers to their local companies, in the form of a substantial monthly access charge.

On the other hand, the local telephone companies were trying to keep rates stable, especially for large business customers that were most likely to "bypass" the local companies by developing their own phone systems. If many major customers were lost, they contended, rates would have to increase for the remaining residential and business customers.

The Idaho Public Utilities Commission was one of the most outspoken opponents in the nation of the so-called interstate "access charges," although it had no jurisdiction over the matter. The IPUC said if they were put into place, long-distance companies would essentially get a free ride; they'd be using and benefiting from the in-place local networks, but paying nothing to use them. Nevertheless, the FCC's monthly customer access charge plan began for business customers in July 1984; they pay $6 per month per line for the privilege of making interstate calls, regardless of whether they actually make such calls. The residential charge starting at $1 per month is due to begin July 1985.

The IPUC has argued that all existing and future long-distance companies should be required to make an equal contribution to the local phone companies they need in order to make their services possible. The Commission has contended that this is the only way to keep basic phone rates affordable and put all of the competing long-distance companies on an equal footing.

IDAHO MOUNTAIN BELL

The Commission's 1984 regulation of Idaho Mountain Bell was highlighted by the conclusion of a major rate case related to the AT&T divestiture.

The IPUC in 1984 also launched an investigation into a number of important Mountain Bell issues: the future of the company's local measured service program, the increasing frequency of public petitions for extended area service, and the fairness of rural zone charges.

Mountain Bell was also very involved in Commission proceedings in 1984 aimed at establishing a formula local telephone companies could use to charge in-state long-distance companies for access to their local facilities. (See Access Charges).

During 1984, Mountain Bell's one-party residential rates rose from the $8.56-$11.16 range to the $9.43-$11.91 range (depending on the exchange); Boise customers, for example, experienced a 7.9% increase.

One-party business rates increased from the $21.44-$27.92 range to the $23.64-$29.79 range; in Boise, the percentage increase for this charge was 8.5%.

Mountain Bell has 285,000 customers in the southern half of Idaho.

IDAHO MOUNTAIN BELL CASES

RATE INCREASE APPLICATION
CASE NO. U-1000-70

Mountain Bell in October 1983 applied for a major rate increase of $13.6 million, or 11.1%.

The rate case was the company's first in the wake of the AT&T divestiture and therefore was one of the most difficult in the IPUC's experience. After Jan. 1, 1984, Mountain Bell was essentially a new phone company, with a new set of revenues and costs. Instead of auditing the company's past operations and allowing the company money for legitimate cost increases, the IPUC could only project what the company's new operation would cost in 1984.

The Commission in May 1984 awarded Mountain Bell a $3.18 million, 2.47% increase that boosted one-party residential bills by an average 29¢.

In doing so, the IPUC rejected many of Bell's cost increase forecasts and reduced its allowable budget in many areas. It also rejected many expenses related to lobbying, charities and corporate image advertising.

An important part of the decision, which the company later appealed to the Idaho Supreme Court, was the IPUC's order that Mountain Bell give back to ratepayers some $1.78 million in earnings it accumulated through federal tax laws that allow it to pay reduced taxes on equipment and capital improvements in the first few years after making the investment. Ratepayers, however, continue to pay as if the company paid the taxes according to a regular schedule. But because many of Mountain Bell's assets have been turned over to AT&T under the terms of the divestiture, the Commission says ratepayers should have their overpayments returned.

Mountain Bell's authorized 14% return on common equity was not changed. Its overall authorized return is 11.9%.

RATE DESIGN/LOCAL MEASURED SERVICE
CASE NO. U-1000-73

The IPUC in April 1984 opened a proceeding to investigate several rate design issues: local measured service, rate groups, extended area service and rural zone charges. There was wide participation in this case, from Idaho businesses to consumer groups to other phone companies serving Idaho.

Local Measured Service: Mountain Bell since 1979 has offered a measured service option, in which the customer pays about half the normal monthly charge for local service, but is also charged for each local call, depending on the time of day, its length and its destination. Mountain Bell says measured service is a low-cost option for customers making few phone calls. It was criticized during the hearing by the IPUC staff and consumer group Idaho Fair Share, who both called it a drain on the company's revenues that would eventually force rates up for all services. The expense of measuring local calls in such detail had to be made up somewhere, both parties argued. Idaho Fair Share said that most of the country's local phone companies wanted eventually to make local measured service mandatory.

Rural Zone Charges & Extended Area Service: The general thrust of this investigation was the fairness of telephone charges paid by rural residents and businesses.

First, rural customers pay each month an additional "zone charge" if they are located outside of the phone company's exchange boundary; the zone increases the more remote the location is. They now range, for example, from $3.10 to $24.18 for one-party residential lines. Second, rural customers tend to make more long-distance calls because their nearest seat of government or large community is often in a different exchange. Because of this, the Commission since 1980 has received, with increasing frequency, public petitions for Extended Area Service - or toll-free, local calling over a wider territory.

A three-day public hearing was held at Boise in November 1984. When the Commission makes its decision in 1985, it will be examining whether continuing the measured service option is in the public interest - and how to more fairly distribute phone costs among urban and rural customers.

WEISER COMPUTER FIRM - A PUBLIC UTILITY?
CASE NO. U-1000-74

Mountain Bell in April 1984 petitioned the IPUC for a declaratory ruling on whether a Weiser computer services firm should be allowed to install a cable across the city's utility poles so it could transmit computer signals and services to its customers. The phone company contended that it had an exclusive monopoly over "the transmission of intelligence by electricity" in its Idaho service area, which includes Weiser. But after a May 7 public hearing, the IPUC dismissed the case, noting that the computer firm could not be considered a public utility because it was not hooking its customers to other customers or to the general telephone network.

GENERAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE NORTHWEST

General Telephone did not request any major rate increases during 1984, although late in the year it applied for an approximate 5% rate boost to cover a shortfall in the revenue it expected from its sale of in-place home and business telephone sets.

The Everett, Washington-based company, with more than 66,000 customers in northern Idaho, was very active in Commission proceedings on in-state access charges that will determine what General Telephone will be allowed to charge new in-state long-distance companies for access to their customers. (See Access Charges.)

The Commission received four petitions from General Telephone customers seeking so-called extended area service - or toll-free calling to nearby communities.

GENERAL TELEPHONE CO. CASES:

CPE AMORTIZATION
CASE NO. U-1002-56/57

General Telephone Co. in November 1984 applied to the IPUC for a 5.94% increase in its basic monthly charges to cover a shortfall in the revenue it expected from its sale of in-place home and business telephone sets. An October directive from the Federal Communications Commission effectively required the IPUC to grant the rate boost; in December, the Commission authorized it, but adjusted the increase to 5.26%, or $1.16 million.

In 1981, the FCC had deregulated the sale of new phone sets and switchboard equipment and directed state regulatory commissions to develop plans for phone companies to dispose of the used, or in-place telephone sets and business equipment they were leasing to customers.

In February 1984, the IPUC said General Telephone could sell to customers their in-place sets at cost; customers leasing regular, "Big Six" phone sets could either purchase them over a two-year amortization period or purchase them outright in one payment.

In October 1984, the FCC issued another directive emphasizing that if telephone companies were not able to recover the full value of the equipment through the sale/amortization plan, they could charge ratepayers for the shortfall. General Telephone

officials said many customers have turned in their telephone equipment, and have purchased phone sets and systems from other vendors, causing the revenue shortfall.

WALLACE/MULLAN TOD-PAC:
CASE NO. U-1002-51

In July 1983, the Commission received a petition from a group of Osburn and Wallace General Telephone customers requesting a discount long-distance calling rate to Coeur d'Alene, Plummer, St. Maries and other northern Idaho communities. After a May public hearing, the IPUC in June 1984 decided to allow customers in the Wallace exchange (which includes Osburn) an optional discount long-distance calling plan called TOD-PAC. The program was allowed on an experimental basis for one year.

TEKOA/TENSED DISCOUNT CALLING
CASE NO. U-1002-52

The IPUC in October 1983 received a petition from 56 Tensed-area General Telephone customers seeking discount long-distance calling from the Idaho-Washington border community of Tekoa to the St. Maries and Plummer-Worley exchanges. After an August 1984 hearing, the Commission in October ruled that it would approve the petition, but it must first obtain a waiver of a legal technicality buried in the massive AT&T divestiture. The divestiture created LATAs (Local Access Transport Areas) between which only long-distance companies can offer service; the Tekoa and St. Maries/Plummer-Worley exchanges are in different LATAs.

MOSCOW-PULLMAN EAS
CASE NO. U-1002-55

In July 1984, the City of Moscow asked the IPUC to conduct hearings that would explore the possibility of establishing extended area service - or local calling - between Moscow, Idaho and Pullman, Wash., just six miles away. The IPUC and the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission held joint hearings on Oct. 3 and Nov. 9 on the matter.

While the idea was strongly supported by businesses, universities and governmental agencies in the two communities, General Telephone initially claimed a two-year, $1.47 million construction program would be required to establish toll-free calling between Moscow and Pullman, resulting in an estimated $657,000 per year in increased annual expenses.

General Telephone said it would prefer to instead continue charging for long-distance, but at a lower rate, with a less dramatic increase in local charges.

Both the staffs of the Idaho and Washington Commissions called for customer surveys to show the extent of support for the program, assuming that basic monthly rates would have to be increased.

Because phone service between Moscow and Pullman crosses the state border, there are more legal difficulties involved in trying to establish toll-free calling between the two communities. First, both commissions would have to arrive at a consensus; secondly, any decision would have to be approved by the Federal Communications Commission, which regulates all interstate phone rates.

The case was unresolved at year-end 1984.

RATHDRUM EAS
CASE NO. U-1002-54

The IPUC in August 1984 received a petition signed by 149 residents in the Lakeland School District - an area on the Rathdrum Prairie northest of Coeur d'Alene - requesting toll-free calling within the district and to Coeur d'Alene. A public hearing was held in December at Coeur d'Alene.

The group, mostly residents of Rathdrum, said that the school district spans at least five different phone exchanges: Rathdrum, Spirit Lake, Bayview, Post Falls and Hayden Lake; calling between them is long-distance. Calls to Coeur d'Alene - Kootenai County's seat and its closest business and shopping community - are also long-distance.

General Telephone officials did not find a sufficient community of interest between the communities to warrant toll-free calling, pointing out its call volume data showing that 58% of Rathdrum customers made no calls to Coeur d'Alene during a test period; 68% made no calls to Hayden Lake, 70% made no calls to Post Falls and 87% made no calls to Spirit Lake.

The case was unresolved at year-end 1984.

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF THE WEST

There was little regulatory activity in the Continental Telephone arena in 1984.

The Bakersfield, California-based company in September 1984 applied for a major rate increases, but public hearings did not begin until January 1985.

Meanwhile, the company actively participated in proceedings related to intrastate access charges. (See Access Charges.)

Continental Telephone serves about 13,000 customers in 20 scattered rural communities, including McCall, Homedale (its Idaho headquarters) and Aberdeen.

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE CO. CASES:

RATE INCREASE APPLICATION
CASE NO. U-1037-51

Continental Telephone in September 1984 applied for an overall $1.2 million, 16% rate increase - a proposal that would increase its revenue from all local rates and charges by 55.7% and from its basic monthly exchange rates by an average 74.4%.

Continental cited increased costs and a need for a higher rate of return. It also pointed out that the company spent $12.6 million between 1979 and 1983 on telephone facilities in Idaho and discussed the higher cost of providing service to its customers, particularly because they are located in rural areas.

The phone company also said its employee wages were to increase in 1985, along with pension expenses and insurance. Central office expenses also have increased, said the company, along with taxes and depreciation on its facilities.

Continental requested an increase in its IPUC-authorized return on common stock from 14.25 to 16.9%.

Continental also proposed to change the way it charges rural customers living outside of the local exchange area. It now charges one-party customers 85¢ extra per month for each quarter mile they live outside of the local exchange boundary; the company wanted to instead charge a flat $4 per month for residents and $6 per month for business customers if they are located outside of the local exchange boundary.

The phone company also proposed to no longer offer party lines to new customers, double the price of a directory listing and increase service charges by 8%.

As a cost-cutting measure, the company proposed to eliminate long-distance discounts for its employees.

A public hearing in McCall was scheduled for January 1985.

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

AT&T Communications, Inc. in 1984 became Idaho's only certified in-state, inter-LATA (see explanation of LATA below) long-distance company.

The company threw much of its energy into Commission proceedings to establish in-state access charges - or the charges Idaho's new interLATA long-distance companies would be required to pay local telephone companies for access. (See Access Charges.)

In September 1984, AT&T applied for a major temporary rate increase, charging that the access charges it was being required to pay on a temporary basis, during the ongoing access charge proceedings, were too high by more than $3.6 million annually.

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY: CASE NO. U-1142-1

AT&T Communications applied in November 1983 for an IPUC certificate to offer long-distance service between Idaho's three LATAs, or Local Access Transport Areas. (Under the terms of the AT&T divestiture, only long-distance companies are allowed to offer long-distance between states and between geographic areas called LATAs. Idaho was given three LATAs: the area south of the Salmon River, General Telephone's northern Idaho service territory, and finally, all other service territories in northern Idaho. In February 1984, AT&T Communiations was granted a certificate and remained the only in-state, inter-LATA long-distance company through year-end 1984, though other companies were expected to apply for certification.

RATE INCREASE APPLICATION CASE NO. U-1142-2

AT&T Communications in September 1984 applied for a temporary $4.4 million, 44% increase in its in-state long-distance rates, contending that its payments to Idaho's local telephone companies for access into their systems was too high by $3.654 million annually. In addition, AT&T asked to raise its in-state long-distance rates so they were equal to its interstate rates (regulated by the Federal Communications Commission).

AT&T said it wanted the majority of the rate increase in effect only until the Commission rules on a current case involving the

payments AT&T Communications must pay Idaho's local telephone companies.

At a Dec. 5 proceeding, the Commission vacated the hearing, ruling that AT&T had not provided the IPUC staff with enough information for it to evaluate the application. The Commission also said it would not even on a temporary basis grant any rate increase to cover alleged overpayments in access charges. More public hearings were scheduled for 1985.

OTHER PHONE COMPANIES

Troy Telephone Co.:

The IPUC in May 1984 granted Troy Telephone Co. a $35,698, 53.5% rate increase - the first increase it has received in about 20 years. The phone company serves the small northern Idaho community of Troy, near Moscow, and the surrounding rural area. The company applied for the increase to pay for a major upgrade program. One-party residential rates, for example, increased from $4.50 to $6.50 per month.

Pine Telephone Co.:

In March 1984, the IPUC ruled that Pine Telephone Co. - a tiny phone company in Halfway, Ore. will be allowed to entend its phone service across the Snake River to residents in the Oxbow Dam, Idaho area. Pine Telephone applied for permission to serve Oxbow in November 1983 after six of the Idaho residents asked for service. The application was opposed by Cambridge Telephone Co., which contended Oxbow was in its certificated area and had plans to eventually install phone service there. Cambridge appealed the decision to the Idaho Supreme Court, where it remained unresolved at year-end 1984.

Midvale Telephone Co.:

Midvale Telephone Co. in February 1984 applied to the IPUC for a certificate to extend phone service into the mountain community of Yellow Pine, located 43 miles east of McCall. Midvale said the project would cost at least $350,000, which it plans to raise through a Rural Electrification Administration loan. It also noted that there were three new gold mines in the area, ranches and subdivided areas with lots for sale. Mountain Bell formally participated in the proceeding, saying it was concerned that the Midvale's proposed expenditures would be recovered, in part, through an increased intrastate toll settlement that would be paid for by other Idaho customers. The first public hearing was scheduled for January 1985 in McCall.

Inland Telephone Co.:

Inland Telephone Co. of Roslyn, Wash. applied for, then later withdrew a major, 52%, $11,794 rate increase. Inland, which serves the rural northern Idaho community of Lenore and the surrounding area, gave no reason for its decision to withdraw.

Silver Star Telephone Co.:

The IPUC in August 1984 granted Silver Star Telephone Co. a $9,900 rate increase for its Irwin exchange customers that boosted monthly one-party residential rate by 89% from $4.17 to $7.89 and multi-party rates by 76%, from $3.34 to $5.89 per month. Silver Star of Freedom, Wyo., serves several Idaho communities. Silver Star had requested a $19,105 increase. The IPUC also resolved a long-standing dispute over which Silver Star customers were residential and which were business by combining the two rate classes.

Albion Telephone Co.:

The IPUC in June 1984 gave Albion Telephone permission to borrow $675,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration to complete a major upgrade project - but warned the company that it would not guarantee approval of future rate boosts to cover the cost. The phone company has 825 customers in the eastern Idaho community of Albion, southeast of Burley. The $3.6 million upgrade will bury many of the company's phone lines and provide more sophisticated phone service to customers.

OTHER TELEPHONE ISSUES

INDEPENDENT COIN TELEPHONES:

Your Telephone Alternative: In January 1984, the IPUC turned down a northern Idaho businessman's request for permission to sell coin telephones. Mike Lind of Hayden Lake, owner of a business called Your Telephone Alternative, said he had many requests from businesses interested in owning their own pay phones. But the Commission said Lind was not able to show that his coin phones were able to connect callers to emergency 911 or operator services, could accept long-distance calls or were hearing aid-compatible. The Commission also said that he could not insure private lines for callers or regular maintenance of the telephones.

T.J. Tallman Co.: In November 1984, the IPUC received a petition from Boise businessman T.J. Tallman, also requesting permission to sell or lease coin phones. Tallman said in his petition that small businesses should be able to own, operate and profit from coin phones "much the same as juke boxes or video games." He also contended that his phones would meet all of the standards suggested by the IPUC when it turned down the Lind proposal earlier in the year. Further proceedings were scheduled for 1985.

TIME OF DAY CHARGES:

Pacific Northwest Bell:

The IPUC held a Lewiston public hearing in November 1984 on a PNB plan to begin charging customers 25¢ for each time-of-day phone call they made. Before the IPUC intervened, PNB had planned to allow a private company to begin offering time-of-day service by Sept 1. The company, called Tel-Time, would charge 25¢ per call (billed to the customer by PNB) and would pay the phone company 15¢. PNB contended that the AT&T divestiture categorized time-of-day as an "information" service, which cannot be offered by the local telephone company alone, but which must be opened to competition. The case was not yet concluded at year-end 1984.

INTRASTATE ACCESS CHARGES

The establishment of fair access charges for new intrastate long-distance companies took up much of the Commission's time and energy in 1984.

In general, the Commission was charged with setting a formula that Idaho's 20 local telephone companies (only 15 are regulated by the IPUC) could use to charge in-state long-distance companies for access to their customers and their facilities.

The problem did not exist until the Jan. 1, 1984 AT&T divestiture. Before that time, all in-state long-distance calling was offered jointly by the state's local telephone companies, which profited from it under a cooperative arrangement.

The AT&T divestiture, however, prohibited local companies from offering long-distance between geographical areas called LATAs (Local Access Transport Areas). Now, only long-distance companies could offer service between Idaho's three LATAs: the entire area south of the Salmon River, General Telephone's northern Idaho service area, and the remainder of northern Idaho.

The change means that part of the local telephone companies' statewide long-distance market has been removed, but they still can charge AT&T Communications and the other new intrastate long-distance companies for access to their customers according to a formula being developed by the Commission.

At year-end 1984, AT&T was the only certified interLATA long-distance company in Idaho, but others were expected to apply for certification and would be affected by whatever formula the Commission decided upon.

On a very basic level, the intrastate access charge proceedings involved finding the fairest way to divide total Idaho telephone facility costs between the local and long-distance phone companies profiting from them.

Long-distance companies, supported by positions taken by the Federal Communications Commission, contended that they should not have to pay for local facilities not used exclusively for long-distance service. They argued that customers should make up the lost local telephone company revenue by paying access charges each month.

The Commission rejected this idea for in-state long-distance

access charges in 1983. But it had little control over customer access charges the FCC authorized for access to interstate long-distance. In June 1983, businesses began paying a $6 per line, per month access charge. A $1 per month access charge was planned for residential customers beginning July 1985.

By year-end 1984, the Commission had a temporary formula in place to compensate local telephone companies for their in-state long-distance costs, but it still had not concluded proceedings by year-end 1984.

WATER COMPANIES

Rathdrum Prairie Water Co.:

Rathdrum Prairie applied in October 1983 for a $64,000, 220% rate increase for its customers in a small real estate development in northern Idaho. Although hearings were scheduled, they were delayed at the request of the company. The IPUC finally dismissed the case in September 1984 because no further action had been taken by the company.

Falls Water Co.:

The IPUC March 1984 authorized Falls Water Co. of Idaho Falls a $34,750, 45% rate increase. Almost all of the company's need for higher rates was related to its increased electrical pumping costs. The water company's rates had not changed in 10 years. It has 1,125 customers.

Hillcrest Water Corporation:

The IPUC held a public hearing in December 1984 on a complaint filed by 27 customers of the Boise-based Hillcrest Water Corp. The customers testified that customers had experienced lower water pressure, air in the lines and problems with the distribution system. The owner said he had corrected most of the problems and was purchasing his water supply from Boise Water Corp. The case was unresolved at year-end 1984. Hillcrest has 75 customers.

McGuire Estates Water System:

The IPUC held a public hearing in December 1984 on a complaint filed by 35 customers complaining of the company's IPUC-authorized increase in rate for unlimited water use from $5 to $7.50 and of poor water pressure. The case was unresolved at year-end. McGuire Estates Water serves 55 customers in a subdivision near Post Falls.

Hayden Pines Water Co.:

Hayden Pines, which serves an area north of Coeur d'Alene, applied for a $92,760, 31.6% rate increase, largely to cover its higher electric pumping costs. A public hearing was scheduled for January 1985. Hayden Pines has about 1,200 customers.

REGULATED CARRIER

The IPUC's Regulated Carrier Division in 1984 beefed up training in hazardous waste inspections, investigated a major Union Pacific proposal to close rural station agencies and continued its policy of streamlining proceedings to avoid unnecessary hearings.

Hazardous wastes:

In 1984, the IPUC's four motor carrier inspectors received special training from the U.S Department of Transportation and the Transporation Safety Institute in idenfifying spilled hazardous substances. The increased staff expertise aided other state and federal authorities with hazardous spill clean-ups. It also allowed the IPUC to assist the U.S. Department of Transporation with investigations of safety violations on vehicles carrying dangerous substances over Idaho highways.

Although stiffer federal regulations meant that most penalties were imposed by the U.S. government, the IPUC also successfully prosecuted for civil damages in Idaho district court a Utah carrier that had spilled sodium dichromate in a March 1984 accident on State Highway 75 near Stanley.

Railroad agency closures:

In December 1983, Union Pacific applied for permission to close 26 rural station agencies; the railroad said freight service would continue to the affected communities, but customers would make shipping arrangements over a toll-free line to one of eight regional centers, equipped with centralized computers used for billing and shipping coordination..

The railroad proposed closures at American Falls, Blackfoot, Aberdeen, Shelley, Rexburg, St. Anthony, Ashton, Newdale, Kellogg, Coeur d'Alene, Sandpoint, Bonners Ferry, Moscow, Orofino, Boise, Weiser, Caldwell, Payette, Parma, Glenns Ferry/Mountain Home, Cascade, Buhl, Burley, Jerome/Wendell, Shoshone/Gooding and Minidoka.

Regional service centers were proposed for Twin Falls, Rupert, Pocatello, Lewiston, Spokane, Wash., Nampa, Emmett and Idaho Falls.

Union Pacific said the plan eventually would produce an annual savings of $1.5 million that would be used to stabilize rail

rates in the state. It also said it would be able to provide equally good service over the toll-free lines.

Public hearings were held in Boise, Twin Falls, Blackfoot and Moscow on the proposal. A decision was still pending at year-end 1984.

Rail freight rates - Rescission of Authority:

The Commission in September 1984 proposed to give up its formal right to review intrastate rail freight rates. The move followed a four-year dispute with the Interstate Commerce Commission, which had continually criticized the IPUC's simple rulebook explaining procedures for setting rail rates within Idaho. The ICC never found fault with the IPUC's compliance with the law, but said the IPUC's rulebook on administrative procedures did not contain enough detail. The Commission only had provisional authority to review the rates anyway; it expired in September 1984, right after the IPUC's proposal to relinquish its authority.

The action had little effect on Idaho's rail shipping rates; the IPUC had the right to object to proposed rail rate increase only when it received protests from shippers. No shippers have ever protested however, and the ICC could have overruled an IPUC decision anyway.

The Commission called the ICC's criticisms "a make-work relief project for the ICC's bureaucracy."

COMMON-CONTRACT INTRASTATE CARRIERS CASE LIST FOR 1984

Applications for new authority	53
Applications for temporary authority	38
Requests for extensions of temporary authority	2
Applications for amendment of authority	13
Applications for transfer of authority	22
Applications for voluntary suspension	29
Applications for voluntary cancellation	9
Requests for name change	5
Requests for extension of compliance period	22
Complaints	78
Notices revoking authority	8

CONSUMER ASSISTANCE

There were increases in complaints related to rate boosts for three of Idaho's electric utilities in 1984, but a drop-off in the number of telephone-related complaints to the Commission.

Overall, the Commission's Consumer Assistance Division experienced a 20% decrease in the total number of complaints and inquiries between 1983 and 1984.

Of the utilities with decreasing complaints, Idaho Power had the least decrease (3%) and Mountain Bell had the greatest (40%).

Among all of the utilities regulated by the IPUC, there was a significant drop in the number of service-related problems and smaller but noticable decrease in complaints related to problems with deposits and billings.

Between 1983 and 1984, however, the IPUC saw many more complaints related to the rates and policies of Idaho utilities, particularly relating to new hookups (utilities unwilling to serve), line extensions and line upgrades.

The number of complaints received from customers facing utility disconnections was about the same in 1983 as 1984.

In 1984, 36% of all contacts with Consumer Assistance involved a pending or actual disconnection, 16% concerned disputed bills, 15% were requests for information, 10% involved a utility's rates or policies, 8% were service-related problems, 3% were line extensions and upgrades, 2% involved a utility's refusal to serve, 2% involved customer deposits and 7% were miscellaneous.

While the Commission expected complaints related to telephone service to dramatically increase in 1984, the numbers actually decreased. Consumer Assistance suggests that the drop-off was partly due to deregulation and divestiture, which removed many phone services from the Commission's jurisdiction.

For example, complaints about phone equipment that would have been filed against Mountain Bell in 1983 were AT&T Information Systems problems in 1984. Some of General Telephone's toll service problems in 1983 became AT&T Communications' problem in 1984. Almost one-half of all the complaints the IPUC received in 1984 over which it had no authority involved either AT&T Information Systems or U.S. West Direct, which now are unregulated companies.

Some Commission officials have postulated that consumers and businesses simply knew more about the effects of divestiture and deregulation after early 1984 - enough for them to know that the many new inconveniences could not be fixed by the IPUC. Consumer Services also suggests that ordinary consumers may not have noticed a drastic difference in the way the telephone system operated on a day-to-day basis, and therefore had less to complain about than they had expected.

COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES RECEIVED

BY THE

IPUC CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION

1981 - 1984

BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES

Company	1981	1982	1983	1984
Idaho Power	629	776	694	672
Intermountain Gas	138	368	338	228
Mountain Bell	648	925	996	598
Boise Water	75	80	80	57

NON-BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES

Company	1981	1982	1983	1984
Utah Power & Light	58	57	71	96
Washington Water Power	56	66	57	86
Continental Telephone	41	55	45	28
General Telephone	68	67	90	71
Pacific Northwest Bell	13	15	29	31

COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES RECEIVED

BY THE

IPUC CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION

PER 1,000 UTILITY CUSTOMERS

1981 - 1984

Company	1981	1982	1983	1984
Idaho Power	2.63	3.23	2.89	2.72
Intermountain Gas	1.49	3.79	3.49	2.40
Mountain Bell	2.50	3.20	3.45	2.08
Boise Water	2.04	2.16	2.16	1.50

NON-BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES

Company	1981	1982	1983	1984
Utah Power & Light	1.44	1.33	1.65	2.40
Washington Water Power	.85	.94	.68	1.03
Continental Telephone	3.19	4.23	3.46	2.15
General Telephone	1.04	1.01	1.35	1.08
Pacific Northwest Bell	.64	.90	1.75	1.41

COMPLAINTS AND INQUIRIES RECEIVED
BY THE IPUC
CONSUMER ASSISTANCE DIVISION

1983 & 1984

BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES

Company	1983	1984	% Increase/ (Decrease)
Idaho Power	694	672	(3)
Intermountain Gas	338	228	(32)
Mountain Bell	996	598	(40)
Boise Water	80	57	(29)

NON BOISE BASED MAJOR UTILITIES

Company	1983	1984	% Increase/ (Decrease)
Utah Power & Light	71	96	35
Washington Water Power	57	86	51
Continental Telephone	45	28	(38)
General Telephone	90	71	(21)
Pacific Northwest Bell	29	31	7

COMPLAINTS & INQUIRIES

1982 - 1984

MONTHLY TOTALS - ALL UTILITIES

Month	1982	1983	1984
January	138	312	158
February	144	293	197
March	255	288	231
April	201	229	185
May	216	224	196
June	233	197	178
July	194	160	142
August	181	163	133
September	219	180	166
October	274	177	188
November	286	195	190
December	282	166	101
ANNUAL TOTAL	2,593	2,584	2,065

COMPLAINTS & INQUIRIES

1982 - 1984

MONTHLY TOTALS
MOUNTAIN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

Month	1982	1983	1984
January	41	127	80
February	51	118	71
March	53	100	57
April	61	85	44
May	81	76	59
June	85	78	42
July	78	63	44
August	75	58	34
September	83	79	43
October	117	69	43
November	101	68	50
December	99	75	31
ANNUAL TOTAL	925	996	598

REGULATED UTILITIES BY CITY

City	Electric Company	Gas Company	Telephone Company
Aberdeen	Idaho Power	IGC	Continental
Albion	Non-regulated*	None	Albion
American Falls	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Ammon	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Arco	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Arimo	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Ashton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Avery	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Bancroft	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Basalt	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Bayview	Non-regulated	None	Gen Tel
Bellevue	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Blackfoot	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Boise	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Bonners Ferry	Non-regulated	WWP	Gen Tel
Bovill	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Buhl	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Burley	Non-regulated	IGC	Mt. Bell
Caldwell	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Cambridge	Idaho Power	None	Cambridge
Carey	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
Cascade	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
Chubbuck	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Clark Fork	PP&L	None	Gen Tel
Cobalt	Idaho Power	None	Lemhi
Coeur d'Alene	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Conda	Non-regulated	None	Mt. Bell
Cottonwood	WWP	None	PNB
Council	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Craigmont	WWP	None	PNB
Culdesac	WWP	None	PNB
Dalton Gardens	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Deary	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Declo	Non-regulated	IGC	Mt. Bell
Dover	PP&L	None	Gen Tel
Downey	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Driggs	Non-regulated	None	Mt. Bell
Eagle	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Eden	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Elk City	WWP	None	ConTel

*A public or cooperatively owned utility not regulated by this Commission.

City	Electric Company	Gas Company	Telephone Company
Emmett	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Fairfield	Non-regulated	None	ConTel
Fe[illegible]wood	WWP	None	Gen Tel
F[illegible]r	Idaho Power	IGC	Non-regulated
Fi[illegible]h	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Fort Hall	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Franklin	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Fruitland	Idaho Power	IGC	Non-regulated
Garden City	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Genesee	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Georgetown	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Glenns Ferry	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Gooding	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Grace	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Grand View	Idaho Power	None	Gem State Util.
Grangeville	WWP	None	PNB
Hagerman	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Hailey	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Hammett	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Hansen	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Harrison	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Hayden	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Hayden Lake	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Hazelton	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Headquarters	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Heyburn	Non-regulated	IGC	Mt. Bell
Homedale	Idaho Power	IGC	ConTel
Horseshoe Bend	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
Idaho Falls	Non-regulated	IGC	Mt. Bell
Inkom	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Iona	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Irwin	Non-regulated	None	Silver Star
Jerome	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Juliaetta	WWP	None	Potlatch
Kamiah	WWP	None	PNB
Kellogg	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Kendrick	WWP	None	Potlatch
Ketchum	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Kimberly	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Kooskia	WWP	None	PNB
Kuna	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Laclede	PP&L	None	Gen Tel
Lapwai	WWP	None	PNB
Lava Hot Springs	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Lewiston	WWP	WWP	PNB
Lewisville	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Lincoln	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Mackay	Non-regulated	None	Mt. Bell

City	Electric Company	Gas Company	Telephone Company
Malad City	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Marsing	Idaho Power	IGC	ConTel
Marysville	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
McCall	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
McCammon	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Menan	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Meridian	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Middleton	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Montpelier	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Moreland	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Moscow	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Mountain Home	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Moyie Springs	Non-regulated	None	Gen Tel
Mullan	Citizen's Utilities	WWP	Gen Tel
Nampa	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Newdale	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
New Meadows	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
New Plymouth	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Nezperce	WWP	None	PNB
Notus	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Oakley	Idaho Power	None	Mt. Bell
Orofino	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Osburn	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Paris	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Parker	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Parma	Idaho Power	IGC	ConTel
Paul	Non-regulated	IGC	Non-regulated
Payette	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Peck	Non-regulated	None	Gen Tel
Pierce	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Pinehurst	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Plummer	Non-regulated	None	Gen Tel
Pocatello	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Ponderay	PP&L	WWP	Gen Tel
Post Falls	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Potlatch	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Preston	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Priest River	PP&L	None	Gen Tel
Rathdrum	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Rexburg	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Richfield	Idaho Power	None	Gem State Util.
Rigby	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Riggins	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
Ririe	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Roberts	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Rockland	Idaho Power	None	Rockland
Rupert	Non-regulated	IGC	Non-regulated
St. Anthony	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell

City	Electric Company	Gas Company	Telephone Company
St. Charles	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
St. Maries	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Salmon	Idaho Power	None	Lemhi
Sandoint	PP&L	None	Gen Tel
Shelley	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Shoshone	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Silverton	Citizen's Util.	None	Gen Tel
Smelterville	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Soda Springs	Non-regulated	IGC	Mt. Bell
Spirit Lake	Non-regulated	None	Gen Tel
Stites	WWP	None	PNB
Sugar City	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Swan Valley	Non-regulated	None	Silver Star
Teton	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Troy	WWP	WWP	Troy
Twin Falls	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Ucon	UP&L	IGC	Mt. Bell
Victor	Non-regulated	None	Mt. Bell
Wallace	Citizen's Utilities	WWP	Gen Tel
Wardner	WWP	WWP	Gen Tel
Weippe	WWP	None	Gen Tel
Weiser	Non-regulated	IGC	Mt. Bell
Wendell	Idaho Power	IGC	Mt. Bell
Weston	UP&L	None	Mt. Bell
Wilder	Idaho Power	None	ConTel
Winchester	WWP	None	PNB
Worley	Non-regulated	None	Gen Tel

UTILITIES UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF
THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ELECTRIC UTILITIES

CITIZENS UTILITIES CO. High Ridge Park Stamford, Connecticut 06906 (203) 328-8800	Robert O'Brien, Asst. V.P.
612 Cedar Street Wallace, Idaho 83873 752-1174	Tom Ferry
IDAHO POWER CO. P.O. Box 70 1220 West Idaho St. Boise, Idaho 83707 383-2220	Don Barclay - 383-2292 Paul Bull - 383-2689 Larry Crowley - 383-2683 Dewey Hammond - 383-2655 John Willmorth - 383-2297
Boise - 383-2259 Caldwell - 459-4661 Emmett - 365-4493 Hailey - 788-2262 McCall - 634-2116	Meridian - 888-4491 Mtn. Home - 587-8411 Nampa - 466-2425 Pocatello - 233-2631 Twin Falls - 733-6880
PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT CO. Public Service Building 920 S.W. 6th Ave. Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 243-1122	Fred Gardner- (503) 243-4621 Steve Pearson-(503) 243-4966 David Sloan- (503) 243-4601 Tim Watson- (503) 243-4591 Phil Wogsberg-(503) 243-4597
Sandpoint - 263-3117	Bill Walman, Ofs. Mgr.
UTAH POWER & LIGHT CO. P.O. Box 899 1407 West North Temple Salt Lake City, Utah 84110 (801) 535-2000	Dean Bryner- (801) 535-4290 Orrin Colby- (801) 535-4040 Al Dunn- (801) 535-4141 Jim Taylor- (801) 535-4242
Preston - 852-1916	Rexburg - 356-7366

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.

P.O. Box 3727
E. 1411 Mission Ave. (99202)
Spokane, Washington 99220
(509) 489-0500

Coeur d'Alene - 664-2165
Lewiston - 743-5541

Tom Dukich - Ext. 2724
Tom Illich - Ext. 2515
Fran Kihara - Ext. 2341
Ron McKenzie - Ext. 2750

Moscow - 882-7551

GAS UTILITIES

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS CO.
P.O. Box 7608
555 So. Cole Road
Boise, Idaho 83707
377-6000

Chuck Hedemark - 377-6085
Jeff Lebens - 377-6055
Reed Penning - 377-6054
Skip Worthan - 377-6058

Emmett - 365-3004
Idaho Falls - 522-6095
Nampa - 467-7491
Payette - 642-3355

Pocatello - 237-1740
Twin Falls - 733-7163
Weiser - 549-0984

WASHINGTON WATER POWER CO.
P.O. Box 3727
E. 1411 Mission Ave. (99202)
Spokane, Washington 99220
(509) 489-0500

Bob McLenden - Ext. 2466

Coeur d'Alene - 664-2165
Lewiston - 743-5541

Moscow - 882-7511

PIPELINE COMPANY

HOLLY TERMINALS, INC. (P-1000)
2600 Diamond Shamrock Tower
717 No. Harwood Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(214) 651-0311

Henry L. Stern

TELEPHONE UTILITIES

AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF MOUNTAIN STATES, INC.
P.O. Box 5020 (80217)
1875 Lawrence St., Rm. 1535
Denver, Colo. 80202
(303) 298-6130

Neil Hinchman

Bob Little
1 North Last Chance Gulch
Helena, Montana 59601
(406) 449-6776

AT&T MOUNTAIN, INC. (U-1143)
SAME AS AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

AT&T NORTHWEST COAST, INC. (U-1144)
SAME AS AT&T COMMUNICATIONS

ALBION TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 98
Albion, Idaho 83311
673-5335

Odeen Redman

CAMBRIDGE TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 86
Cambridge, Idaho 83601
257-3314

Richard Wiggins

CONTINENTAL TELEPHONE CO.
(805) 393-4491
P.O. Box 5246
1350 Norris Road
Bakersfield, Calif. 93388
(805) 393-4011

R.W. Winchester

P.O. Box 127
Homedale, Idaho 83628

Dee Monson, 337-3222

McCall - 634-5333

Aloa Stevens

GEM STATE UTILITIES
c/o Pacific Telecom, Inc.
P.O. Box 9901, 805 Broadway
Vancouver, Washington 98668
(206) 696-6941

Vern Dunham, V.P.
C.E. Robinson, Pres.
Romi Kanal (Tariffs)

TELEPHONE UTILITIES
(Cont'd.)

GENERAL TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 1003 1800 41st Street Everett, Washington 98201 Coeur d'Alene - 772-8311 Moscow - 882-0268	Rod Benson - (206) 258-5026 Bill Miller - (206) 258-5088 (206) 258-5321 Sandpoint - 263-0577, Ext. 204
INLAND TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 171 Roslyn, Wash. 98914 (509) 649-2211	Harold Weis Ed MacKenzie
CENTURY TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 1007 Salmon, Idaho 83467 756-3300	Frank Barsalou Ron Schluter
Century Telephone P.O. Box 111 (1905 Ward St.) LaCrosse, Wis. 54601 (608) 782-9980	Marvin Cunningham
P.O. Box 4065 Monroe, LA 71211 (318) 387-5541	Bruce Hanks
MIDVALE TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 7 Midvale, Idaho 83645 355-2211	Lane Williams
MOUNTAIN BELL TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 7888 Boise, Idaho 83723 385-2000	C.E. (Gene) Hill - 385-2628 Wayne Durnil - 385-2734 Jim Wozniak - 385-2030
PACIFIC NW BELL TELEPHONE 1600 Bell Plaza Seattle, Wash. 98191 (206) 345-5921	Mike Moran - (206) 345-5930 Bob McGinnis - (206) 345-4742 George Walker - (206) 345-3000
POTLATCH TELEPHONE CO. P.O. Box 121 Kendrick, Idaho 83537 289-5701	Don Eichner

TELEPHONE UTILITIES
(Cont'd)

ROCKLAND TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 269
Rockland, Idaho 83271
548-2345

Leonard May

RURAL TELEPHONE CO.
6110 Garfield Ave.
P.O. Box 41957
Sacramento, Calif. 95841
(916) 486-1244

Wayne Irwin

SILVER STAR TELEPHONE CO.
Freedom, Wyo. 83120
(307) 883-2411

Melvin Hoopes

TROY TELEPHONE CO.
P.O. Box 25
Troy, Idaho 83871
835-2211

Jerry Brown

Telephone & Data Systems
P.O. Box 5158
517 North Segoe Rd.
Madison, Wis. 53705
(608) 845-6731

Charles Ricker

WATER UTILITIES

BARBER WATER CORPORATION 3550 Triplett Lane Boise, Idaho 83702	345-9384 Dave Triplett
BAR CIRCLE "S" RANCH, INC. 2951 No. Government Way Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814	667-4621 Robert Turnipseed
BOISE WATER CORPORATION P.O. Box 7488 Boise, Idaho 83707	362-1300 Ben Hepler - 362-2618
BRIAN WATER CORPORATION P.O. Box 7345 Boise, Idaho 83707	342-4791 Larry Eno
CAPITOL SECURITIES WATER CORP. 2626 Eldorado Boise, Idaho 83704	375-0931 R. (Bob) Price
CITIZENS UTILITIES WATER 612 Cedar Street Wallace, Idaho 83873	752-1174 Jerry Zeller
CLEARVIEW WATER CORP. 1811 North 32nd Boise, Idaho 83703	342-1619 Gordon Pittenger
EAGLE RANCH WATER COMPANY P.O. Box 455 Eagle, Idaho 83616	939-0242 R. (Bob) DeShazo
EAST MORELAND WATER CO. 270 N.E. Main Street Blackfoot, Idaho 83221	785-5450 L.A. Jacobsen
EVER-GREEN LANDSCAPING, INC. Portneuf Road, Box 4404 Inkom, Idaho 83245	775-3573 Jerry Dunne
FALLS WATER COMPANY, INC. 405 11th Street Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401	522-1300 Kelly Howell
HAYDEN PINES WATER CO. 8601 No. Hayden Pines Way Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835	772-3619 C. (Bud) Ford

WATER UTILITIES
(Cont'd.)

HILLCREST WATER CORP. P.O. Box 7927 Boise, Idaho 83707	375-7200 Jack Rencher
KETCHUM SPRING WATER SUPPLY CO., INC. P.O. Box 1498 Hailey, Idaho 83333	788-4051 Wilhelmus Touw
McGUIRE ESTATES WATER CO. S. 1115 Cedar Spokane, Wash. 99204	Pauline Lundy
MURRAY WATERWORKS (U-1039) Box 426 Murray, Idaho 83874	(509) 924-2789 Harry Almquist
NORTHGATE ENTERPRISES P.O. Box 2432 Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401	523-2251 Jerry Ferguson
PICABO LIVESTOCK COMPANY Picabo, Idaho 83348	788-2516 Leonard Purdy
RATHDRUM PRAIRIE WATER CO., INC. P.O. Box 1090 Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835	667-2435 Larry Gilman
SOUTH COUNTY WATER CO., INC. P.O. Box 7361 Boise, Idaho 83707	375-1130 Keith Stokes
SPIRIT LAKE EAST WATER CO. c/o Hanson Properties, Box 7310 Spokane, Washington 99207	(509) 467-0770 Frank Carr
SUNBEAM WATER CO. P.O. Box 5361 Pocatello, Idaho 83201	237-1110 Allen Frew
SUNSET HEIGHTS WATER CO. Route 1, Box 224-50 Salmon, Idaho 83467	756-3611 Ralston Adams
TROY HOFFMAN WATER CORP. 920 Hoffman Avenue Coeur d'Alene, Idaho 83814	664-6208 June Shuster

WARM SPRINGS MESA, INC.
2843 Star Circle
Boise, Idaho 83706

344-2603
Paul Wise

COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC UTILITIES OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

CLEARWATER POWER CO.
P.O. Box 997
Lewiston, Idaho 83501
743-1501

EAST END MUTUAL ELECTRIC CO.
528 "E" Street
Rupert, Idaho 83350
436-9357

FALL RIVER RURAL ELECTRIC
714 Main Street
Ashton, Idaho 83420
652-7431

IDAHO COUNTY LIGHT & POWER
P.O. Drawer B
Grangeville, Idaho 83530
983-1610

KOOTENAI ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
P.O. Box K
Hayden Lake, Idaho 83835
772-7551

LOST RIVER ELECTRIC CO-OP, INC.
P.O. Box 417
Mackay, Idaho 83251
588-3311

NORTHERN LIGHTS, INC.
P.O. Box 310
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864
263-5141

PRAIRIE POWER CO-OP, INC.
Box 187
Fairfield, Idaho 83327
764-2214

RAFT RIVER ELEC. CO-OP, INC.
Box 617
Malta, Idaho 83342
645-2211

RURAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
P.O. Box 647
Rupert, Idaho 83350
436-4781

SALMON RIVER ELEC. CO-OP
P.O. Box 384
Challis, Idaho 83226
879-2283

SNAKE RIVER POWER ASSN.
P.O. Box 617
Malta, Idaho 83342
645-2211

SOUTH SIDE ELECTRIC LINES
P.O. Box 142
Declo, Idaho 83323
654-2313

NOTE: The Idaho Public Utilities Commission does not regulate cooperative or municipal telephone or electric utilities; however, they are listed as a courtesy.

MUNICIPAL ELECTRIC UTILITIES OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

ALBION LIGHT & WATER PLANT
P.O. Box 163
Albion, Idaho 83311
673-5351

BONNERS FERRY LIGHT & WATER
P.O. Box 149
Bonners Ferry, Idaho 83805
267-3105

BURLEY MUNI. DISTRIB. SYSTEM
P.O. Box 1090, 2020 Park Ave.
Burley, Idaho 83318
678-2538

DECLO MUNI. ELECTRIC DEPT.
P.O. Box 141
Declo, Idaho 83323
654-6391

DUBOIS ELECTRIC SYSTEM
Box 27
Dubois, Idaho 83423
374-5241

HEYBURN ELECTRIC DEPT.
941 18th Street, Box 147
Heyburn, Idaho 83336
678-8158

IDAHO FALLS ELEC. LIGHT DIV.
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402
529-1430

MINIDOKA ELECTRIC DEPT.
Minidoka, Idaho 83343
531-4101

PLUMMER ELECTRIC DEPT.
Plummer, Idaho 83851
686-1422

RUPERT ELECTRICAL DEPT.
P.O. Box 426
Rupert, Idaho 83350
436-9608

SODA SPRINGS MUNI. ELEC. LIGHT AND POWER DEPT.
9 West 2nd South
Soda Springs, Idaho 83276
547-2151

WEISER WATER & LIGHT DEPT.
55 West Idaho Street
Weiser, Idaho 83672
549-1965

WORLEY ELECTRIC DEPT.
Worley, Idaho 83876
686-1258

SOURCE: ELECTRICAL WORLD Directory of Electric Utilities, 1982-1983, 91st Edition

TELEPHONE COOPERATIVES
OPERATING IN THE STATE OF IDAHO

CUSTER TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE, INC. P.O. Box 324 Challis, Idaho 83226	879-2281 Clarence Leuzinger
FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY, LTD. P.O. Box 346 Fruitland, Idaho 83619	452-4241 Bill Watkins
FILER MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY P.O. Box 89, 405 Main St. Filer, Idaho 83328	326-4331 John Gunn
MUD LAKE TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE P.O. Box 235 Dubois, Idaho 83423	374-5401 H.E. Kator
PROJECT MUTUAL TELEPHONE COOP. ASSOCATION, INC. ASSOC., INC. P.O. Box 366 Rupert, Idaho 83350	436-3131 Jeff Adams

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

P.O. Box 3621
1002 N.E. Holladay Street
Portland, Oregon 97208
(503) 230-3000

Walla Walla Area Office

West 101 Poplar
Walla Walla, Washington 99362
(509) 414-5500

Idaho Falls Area Office

531 Lomax - P.O. Box 2558
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401
(208) 523-2706

Boise Area Office

Fred Rettenmund
Owyhee Plaza, Suite 245
1109 Main Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
(208) 334-9137

NORTHWEST POWER PLANNING COUNCIL

700 S.W. Taylor Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97205
(503) 222-5161

TOLL FREE - 1-800-222-3355

Boise Area Office

450 West State Street
Statehouse
Boise, Idaho 83720

(208) 334-2956

COMPARISON OF RESIDENTIAL ELECTRIC & GAS RATES WITHIN THE STATE OF IDAHO

As of December 31, 1984

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
3-1-41	$ 10.18	$ 16.93	$ 30.43
3-1-55	8.36	13.61	25.61
7-1-55	7.85	12.85	24.85
7-1-60	8.85	13.68	26.52
2-4-74	9.48	14.10	27.36
8-1-76	10.27	15.68	30.51
11-1-76	10.55	18.05	33.05
12-18-77	11.23	19.43	35.82
7-1-78	11.71	20.24	37.30
3-4-80	12.54	22.29	41.78
3-22-81	14.56	26.33	49.86
3-13-82	15.88	28.96	53.71
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
3-1-41	2.036 ¢	1.693 ¢	1.521 ¢
3-1-55	1.672	1.361	1.281
7-1-55	1.570	1.285	1.243
7-1-60	1.770	1.368	1.326
2-4-74	1.896	1.410	1.368
8-1-76	2.054	1.568	1.526
11-1-76	2.110	1.805	1.653
12-18-77	2.246	1.943	1.791
7-1-78	2.342	2.024	1.865
3-4-80	2.508	2.229	2.089
3-22-81	2.912	2.633	2.493
3-13-82	3.176	2.896	2.686

CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY
(cont'd)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
Average Monthly Billing			
3-9-83	$ 17.81	$ 32.76	$ 62.66
3-18-84	19.78	36.69	70.52
Relative Cost per Kwh			
3-9-83	3.562 ¢	3.276 ¢	3.133 ¢
3-18-84	3.956	3.669	3.526

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
3-21-51	$ 9.75	$ 12.35	$ 27.35
9-22-52	11.35	14.15	31.64
1-2-63	11.41	15.18	31.48
1-25-71	11.55	16.36	28.46
12-2-74	11.66	17.02	30.22
1-28-76	13.42	19.56	34.96
4-22-77	14.37	20.95	37.44
2-24-78	12.68	21.85	40.20
3-23-79	14.49	24.97	45.94
3-28-80	18.25	31.46	57.88
10-1-81	12.00	26.00	60.85
11-2-81	13.80	29.90	70.40
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
3-21-51	1.950 ¢	1.235 ¢	1.368 ¢
9-22-52	2.270	1.415	1.581
1-2-63	2.282	1.518	1.574
1-25-71	2.310	1.636	1.423
12-2-74	2.332	1.702	1.511
1-28-76	2.684	1.956	1.748
4-22-77	2.874	2.095	1.872
2-24-78	2.536	2.185	2.010
3-23-79	2.898	2.497	2.297
3-28-80	3.650	3.146	2.894
10-1-81	2.400	2.600	3.043
11-2-81	2.760	2.990	3.520

IDAHO POWER COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
Average Monthly Billing				
12-2-81	$ 11.57	$ 25.45	$ 61.50	BPA Credit
2-9-82	12.53	27.58	65.91	
8-25-82	17.23	34.45	68.91	
2-8-83	17.93	35.86	71.72	
Relative Cost per Kwh				
12-2-81	2.314 ¢	2.545 ¢	3.075 ¢	
2-9-82	2.506	2.758	3.296	
8-25-82	3.445	3.445	3.445	
2-8-83	3.586	3.586	3.586	

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
		Average Monthly Billing		
7-9-58	$ 8.10	$ 12.70	$ 24.70	
12-19-74	9.21	15.10	29.60	
8-3-76	9.99	16.67	32.77	
8-1-78	11.19	20.37	38.75	
3-4-80	11.87	21.75	41.50	
3-22-81	13.21	24.42	46.84	
10-1-81	12.65	23.30	44.60	BPA Credit
3-4-82	10.83	25.78	54.94	
10-1-82	15.60	31.20	62.40	
1-1-83	17.55	35.09	70.18	
3-7-83	19.31	38.61	77.22	
7-1-83	18.96	37.92	75.84	
		Relative Cost per Kwh		
7-9-58	1.620 ¢	1.270 ¢	1.235 ¢	
12-19-74	1.842	1.510	1.470	
8-3-76	1.998	1.667	1.639	
8-1-78	2.238	2.037	1.938	
3-4-80	2.374	2.175	2.075	
3-22-81	2.642	2.442	2.342	
10-1-81	2.530	2.330	2.223	
3-4-82	2.166	2.578	2.747	
10-1-82	3.120	3.120	3.120	
1-1-83	3.509	3.509	3.509	
3-7-83	3.861	3.861	3.861	
7-1-83	3.792	3.792	3.792	

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-1-83	$ 20.63	$ 41.26	$ 82.52
1-26-84	22.32	44.64	89.28
3-19-84	22.55	45.09	90.18
7-1-84	21.76	43.52	87.04
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
11-1-83	4.126 ¢	4.126 ¢	4.126 ¢
1-26-84	4.464	4.464	4.464
3-19-84	4.509	4.509	4.509
7-1-84	4.352	4.352	4.352

UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-13-44	$ 10.10	$ 14.60	$ 29.60
9-7-58	10.86	15.61	31.61
8-1-64	11.36	16.36	23.26
1-1-69	11.82	17.04	25.55
5-14-72	12.29	17.72	27.76
1-20-75	14.98	21.58	33.82
"-1-75	16.49	23.74	32.71
1-1-76	18.95	27.30	42.79
5-1-76	19.70	30.48	49.19
10-3-77	15.68	32.95	57.50
3-21-78	20.35	36.70	57.85
1-1-79	23.18	41.81	65.77
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
11-13-44	2.020 ¢	1.460 ¢	1.480 ¢
9-7-58	2.172	1.561	1.581
8-1-64	2.272	1.636	1.163
1-1-69	2.365	1.704	1.278
5-14-72	2.458	1.772	1.388
1-20-75	2.996	2.158	1.691
5-1-75	3.296	2.374	1.861
1-1-76	3.790	2.730	2.140
5-1-76	3.940	3.048	2.460
10-3-77	3.136	3.295	2.875
3-21-78	4.070	3.670	2.893
1-1-79	4.636	4.181	3.289

UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
		Average Monthly Billing		
6-15-79	$ 27.67	$ 49.91	$ 78.65	
4-1-80	33.88	62.33	99.11	
5-27-81	33.20	66.40	109.33	
10-3-81	34.37	68.73	113.16	
10-3-81	24.84	49.67	75.04	BPA Credit
10-1-82	29.99	59.98	91.55	
11-18-82	30.19	60.38	92.20	
5-4-84	29.42	58.84	94.44	
9-13-84	32.11	64.22	102.41	
		Relative Cost per Kwh		
6-15-79	5.534 ¢	4.991 ¢	3.933 ¢	
4-1-80	6.776	6.233	4.955	
5-27-81	6.6398	6.6398	5.4665	
10-3-81	6.8732	6.8732	5.6582	
10-3-81	4.968	4.967	3.752	
10-1-82	5.998	5.998	4.577	
11-18-82	6.038	6.038	4.610	
5-4-84	5.884	5.884	4.722	
9-13-84	6.422	6.422	5.121	

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)
		Average Monthly Billing	
2-14-53	$ 6.71	$ 11.51	$ 23.51
6-11-56	8.01	12.42	24.65
5-6-60	8.70	12.90	24.90
4-25-67	8.45	12.62	24.45
5-26-69	8.20	12.54	22.86
9-24-70	7.85	12.35	20.60
9-13-73	7.90	12.45	20.80
11-13-74	8.24	13.39	23.02
8-12-75	7.85	13.20	23.90
11-27-76	8.30	14.00	25.40
4-15-78	9.34	16.07	29.54
10-17-79	9.98	17.15	33.32
		Relative Cost per Kwh	
2-14-53	1.341 ¢	1.151 ¢	1.175 ¢
6-11-56	1.601	1.242	1.233
5-6-60	1.740	1.290	1.245
4-25-67	1.690	1.267	1.225
5-26-69	1.640	1.254	1.143
9-24-70	1.570	1.235	1.030
9-13-73	1.580	1.245	1.040
11-13-74	1.648	1.339	1.151
8-12-75	1.570	1.320	1.195
11-27-76	1.660	1.400	1.270
4-15-78	1.868	1.607	1.477
10-17-79	1.996	1.715	1.666

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Straight Residential (500 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential W/Water Heater (1000 Kwh/Mo.)	Residential All-Electric (1000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.) (3000 Kwh/Mo. 6 Mos.)	
Average Monthly Billing				
8-11-80	$ 10.30	$ 19.00	$ 40.06	
12-1-80	10.60	19.68	41.63	
10-23-81	10.00	22.36	52.47	
11-13-81	9.00	20.35	48.45	BPA Credit
1-18-82	9.00	20.35	48.45	
10-1-82	10.14	22.67	52.30	
11-1-82	10.34	23.06	53.23	
1-31-83	10.38	23.14	53.39	
2-9-84	14.45	31.28	70.44	
3-30-84	14.58	31.55	70.97	
Relative Cost per Kwh				
8-11-80	2.060 ¢	1.900 ¢	2.003 ¢	
12-1-80	2.120	1.968	2.082	
10-23-81	2.000	2.236	2.624	
11-13-81	1.800	2.035	2.423	
1-18-82	1.800	2.035	2.423	
10-1-82	2.028	2.267	2.615	
11-1-82	2.067	2.306	2.662	
1-31-83	2.075	2.314	2.670	
2-9-84	2.889	3.128	3.522	
3-30-84	2.915	3.155	3.549	

Straight Residential Service
Average Billings - 500 Kwh Per Month

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company
3-1-41	$ 10.18				
11-13-44				$ 10.10	
3-21-51		$ 9.75			
9-22-52		11.35			
2-14-53					$ 6.71
3-1-55	8.36				
7-1-55	7.85				
6-11-56					8.01
7-9-58			$ 8.10		
9-7-58				10.86	
5-6-60					8.70
7-1-60	8.85				
1-2-63		11.41			
8-1-64				11.36	
4-25-67					8.45
1-1-69				11.82	
5-26-69					8.20
9-24-70					7.85
1-25-71		11.55			
5-14-72				12.29	
9-13-73					7.90
2-4-74	9.48				
11-13-74					8.24
12-2-74		11.66			
12-19-74			9.21		
1-20-75				14.98	
5-1-75				16.49	
8-12-75					7.85
1-1-76				18.95	
1-28-76		13.42			
5-1-76				19.70	
8-1-76	10.27				
8-3-76			9.99		
11-1-76	10.55				
11-27-76					8.30
4-22-77		14.37			
10-3-77				15.68	
12-18-77	11.23				
2-24-78		12.68			
3-21-78				20.35	
4-15-78					9.34
7-1-78	11.71				
8-1-78			11.19		
1-1-79				23.18	
3-23-79		14.49			
6-15-79				27.67	

Average Billings - 500 Kwh Per Month (cont'd.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company
10-17-79					$ 9.98
3-4-80	$ 12.54		$ 11.87		
3-28-80		$ 18.25			
4-1-80				$ 33.88	
8-11-80					10.30
12-1-80					10.60
3-22-81	14.56		13.21		
5-27-81				33.20	
10-1-81		12.00	12.65		
10-3-81				34.37	
10-3-81				24.84	
10-23-81					10.00
11-2-81		13.80			
11-13-81					9.00
12-2-81		11.57			
2-9-82		12.53			
3-4-82			10.83		
3-13-82	15.88				
8-25-82		17.23			
10-1-82			15.60	29.99	10.14
11-1-82					10.34
11-18-82				30.19	
1-1-83			17.55		
1-31-83					10.38
2-8-83		17.93			
3-7-83			19.31		
3-9-83	17.81				
7-1-83			18.96		
11-1-83			20.63		
1-26-84			22.32		
2-9-84					14.45
3-18-84	19.78				
3-19-84			22.55		
3-30-84					14.58
5-4-84				29.42	
7-1-84			21.76		
9-13-84				32.11	

Residential Service With Water Heating
Average Billings - 1000 Kwh Per Month

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company
3-1-41	$ 16.93				
11-13-44				$ 14.60	
3-21-51		$ 12.35			
9-22-52		14.15			
2-14-53					$ 11.51
3-1-55	13.61				
7-1-55	12.85				
6-11-56					12.42
7-9-58			$ 12.70		
9-7-58				15.61	
5-6-60					12.90
7-1-60	13.68				
1-2-63		15.18			
8-1-64				16.36	
4-25-67					12.62
1-1-69				17.04	
5-26-69					12.54
9-24-70					12.35
1-25-71		16.36			
5-14-72				17.72	
9-13-73					12.45
2-4-74	14.10				
11-13-74					13.39
12-2-74		17.02			
12-19-74			15.10		
1-20-75				21.58	
5-1-75				23.74	
8-12-75					13.20
1-1-76				27.30	
1-28-76		19.56			
5-1-76				30.48	
8-1-76	15.68				
8-3-76			16.67		
11-1-76	18.05				
11-27-76					14.00
4-22-77		20.95			
10-3-77				32.95	
12-18-77	19.43				
2-24-78		21.85			
3-21-78				36.70	
4-15-78					16.07
7-1-78	20.24				
8-1-78			20.37		
1-1-79				41.81	
3-23-79		24.97			
6-15-79				49.91	

Average Billings - 1000 Kwh Per Month
(cont'd.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company
10-17-79					$ 17.15
3-4-80	$ 22.29		$ 21.75		
3-28-80		$ 31.46			
4-1-80				$ 62.33	
8-11-80					19.00
12-1-80					19.68
3-22-81	26.33		24.42		
5-27-81				66.40	
10-1-81		26.00	23.30		
10-3-81				68.73	
10-3-81				49.67	
10-23-81					22.36
11-2-81		29.90			
11-13-81					20.35
12-2-81		25.45			
2-9-82		27.58			
3-4-82			25.78		
3-13-82	28.96				
8-25-82		34.45			
10-1-82			31.20	59.98	22.67
11-1-82					23.06
11-18-82				60.38	
1-1-83			35.09		
1-31-83					23.14
2-8-83		35.86			
3-7-83			38.61		
3-9-83	32.76				
7-1-83			37.92		
11-1-83			41.26		
1-26-84			44.64		
2-9-84					31.28
3-18-84	36.69				
3-19-84			45.09		
3-30-84					31.55
5-4-84				58.85	
7-1-84			43.52		
9-13-84				64.22	

All-Electric Residential Service

Average Bills - 1000 Kwh (6 Mos.) & 3000 Kwh (6 Mos.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company
3-1-41	$ 30.43				
11-13-44				$ 29.60	
3-21-51		$ 27.35			
9-22-52		31.64			
2-14-53					$ 23.51
3-1-55	25.61				
7-1-55	24.85				
6-11-56					24.65
7-9-58			$ 24.70		
9-7-58				31.61	
5-6-60					24.90
7-1-60	26.52				
1-2-63		31.48			
8-1-64				23.26	
4-25-67					24.45
1-1-69				25.55	
5-26-69					22.86
9-24-70					20.60
1-25-71		28.46			
5-14-72				27.76	
9-13-73					20.80
2-4-74	27.36				
11-13-74					23.02
12-2-74		30.22			
12-19-74			29.60		
1-20-75				33.82	
5-1-75				32.71	
8-12-75					23.90
1-1-76				42.79	
1-28-76		34.96			
5-1-76				49.19	
8-1-76	30.51				
8-3-76			32.77		
11-1-76	33.05				
11-27-76					25.40
4-22-77		37.44			
10-3-77				57.50	
12-18-77	35.82				
2-24-78		40.20			
3-21-78				57.85	
4-15-78					29.54
7-1-78	37.30				
8-1-78			38.75		
1-1-79				65.77	
3-23-79		45.94			
6-15-79				78.65	

Average Bills - 1000 Kwh (6 Mos.) & 3000 Kwh (6 Mos.) (cont'd.)

	Citizens Utilities Company	Idaho Power Company	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Company
10-17-79					$ 33.32
3-4-80	$ 41.78		$ 41.50		
3-28-80		$ 57.88			
4-1-80				$ 99.11	
8-11-80					40.06
12-1-80					41.63
3-22-81	49.86		46.84		
5-27-81				109.33	
10-1-81		60.85	44.60		
10-3-81				113.16	
10-3-81				75.04	
10-23-81					52.47
11-2-81		70.40			
11-13-81					48.45
12-2-81		61.50			
2-9-82		65.91			
3-4-82			54.94		
3-13-82	53.71				
8-25-82		68.91			
10-1-82			62.40	91.55	52.30
11-1-82					53.23
11-18-82				92.20	
1-1-83			70.18		
1-31-83					53.39
2-8-83		71.72			
3-7-83			77.22		
3-9-83	62.66				
7-1-83			75.84		
11-1-83			82.52		
1-26-84			89.28		
2-9-84					70.44
3-18-84	70.52				
3-19-84			90.18		
3-30-84					70.97
5-4-84				94.44	
7-1-84			87.04		
9-13-84				102.41	

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-20-69	$ 2.31	$ 5.18	$ 12.80
1-1-71	2.65	5.65	13.75
4-15-71	2.75	5.95	14.65
8-11-72	2.95	6.39	15.69
4-15-73	2.97	6.46	15.90
10-19-73	3.02	6.59	16.29
11-25-73	3.02	6.61	16.35
1-1-74	3.19	7.11	17.85
4-1-74	3.23	7.23	18.21
7-23-74	3.59	7.97	19.31
12-1-74	3.84	8.74	21.62
4-1-75	3.90	8.91	22.14
8-5-75	4.17	9.71	24.53
11-1-75	4.16	9.98	25.35
10-20-76	4.90	11.77	30.50
4-1-77	4.74	11.30	29.10
10-2-77	4.95	11.94	31.00
12-19-77	4.97	11.25	30.01
4-12-78	5.10	11.61	31.15
		Relative Cost per Therm	
11-20-69	23.1 ¢	17.3 ¢	14.2 ¢
1-1-71	26.5	18.8	15.3
4-15-71	27.5	19.8	16.3
8-11-72	29.5	21.3	17.4
4-15-73	29.7	21.5	17.7
10-19-73	30.2	22.0	18.1
11-25-73	30.2	22.0	18.2
1-1-74	31.9	23.7	19.8
4-1-74	32.3	24.1	20.2
7-23-74	35.9	26.6	21.4
12-1-74	38.4	29.6	24.0
4-1-75	39.0	29.7	24.6
8-5-75	41.7	32.4	27.3
11-1-75	42.6	33.3	28.2
10-20-76	49.0	39.2	33.9
4-1-77	47.4	37.7	32.3
10-2-77	49.6	39.8	34.4
12-19-77	49.7	37.5	33.3
4-12-78	51.0	38.7	34.6

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
	Average Monthly Billing		
9-20-78	$ 5.26	$ 11.97	$ 32.10
10-1-78	5.27	12.22	33.06
11-15-79	6.44	15.56	42.92
1-1-80	6.43	15.63	43.23
4-1-80	6.43	17.91	50.63
10-1-80	6.10	16.98	47.18
11-1-80	7.90	19.71	49.00
4-1-81	7.85	19.56	48.56
10-1-81	8.50	21.52	54.44
12-12-81	8.92	22.76	58.14
2-16-82	9.25	22.75	58.14
10-1-82	9.49	23.48	60.32
11-1-82	10.21	25.64	65.79
12-1-82	10.10	25.51	64.74
4-1-83	9.99	24.96	63.75
4-30-83	9.77	24.30	61.77
10-1-83	9.58	23.74	60.11
4-1-84	9.96	24.88	63.50
7-1-84	9.89	24.66	62.85
	Relative Cost per Therm		
9-20-78	52.6 ¢	39.9 ¢	35.7 ¢
10-1-78	52.7	40.7	36.7
11-15-79	64.4	51.9	47.7
1-1-80	64.3	52.1	48.0
4-1-80	64.3	59.7	56.3
10-1-80	61.0	56.6	52.4
11-1-80	79.0	65.7	54.4
4-1-81	78.5	65.2	54.0
10-1-81	85.0	71.7	60.5
12-12-81	89.2	75.9	64.6
2-16-82	92.5	75.8	64.6
10-1-82	94.9	78.3	67.02
11-1-82	102.1	85.5	73.1
12-1-82	101.0	85.0	71.9
4-1-83	99.9	83.2	70.8
4-30-83	97.7	81.0	68.6
10-1-83	95.8	79.1	66.8
4-1-84	99.6	82.9	70.6
7-1-84	98.9	82.2	69.8

INTERMOUNTAIN GAS COMPANY
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
11-1-84	$ 9.66	$ 23.99	$ 60.85
		Relative Cost per Therm	
11-1-84	96.6 ¢	80.0 ¢	67.6 ¢

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY

GAS

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
8-10-58	$ 3.05	$ 6.05	$ 12.53
3-26-59	2.25	6.15	12.63
4-24-64	1.50	4.50	12.43
5-10-67	1.45	4.35	12.10
3-31-71	1.48	4.44	12.40
11-1-71	1.54	4.62	12.89
4-15-73	1.57	4.71	13.21
10-1-73	1.59	4.77	13.41
1-1-74	1.76	5.29	14.89
4-1-74	1.81	5.43	15.34
12-6-74	2.08	6.24	17.82
8-13-75	4.20	7.60	17.80
1-24-76	4.61	8.85	21.55
12-16-76	4.73	8.99	21.77
4-1-77	5.03	9.88	24.43
10-1-77	5.24	10.48	26.23
10-7-78	5.47	11.21	28.42
10-1-79	5.87	12.02	30.46
4-1-80	6.68	14.43	37.70
		Relative Cost per Therm	
8-10-58	30.50 ¢	20.17 ¢	13.92 ¢
3-26-59	22.50	20.50	14.03
4-24-64	15.00	15.00	13.81
5-10-67	14.50	14.50	13.44
3-31-71	14.80	14.80	13.78
11-1-71	15.35	15.35	14.32
4-15-73	15.70	15.70	14.68
10-1-73	15.90	15.90	14.90
1-1-74	17.58	17.58	16.54
4-1-74	18.07	18.07	17.04
12-6-74	20.83	20.83	19.80
8-13-75	42.00	25.35	19.78
1-24-76	46.10	29.50	23.94
12-16-76	47.30	29.97	24.19
4-1-77	50.30	32.93	27.14
10-1-77	52.40	34.93	29.14
10-7-78	54.70	37.37	31.58
10-1-79	58.70	40.07	33.84
4-1-80	66.80	48.10	41.89

WASHINGTON WATER POWER COMPANY - GAS
(cont'd.)

Tariff Changes	Residential 10 Therms	Residential 30 Therms	Residential 90 Therms
		Average Monthly Billing	
8-11-80	$ 6.76	$ 14.67	$ 38.40
10-1-80	7.28	16.25	43.16
12-1-80	7.30	16.30	43.31
4-1-81	7.22	16.05	42.54
10-1-81	7.89	18.08	48.64
10-23-81	8.14	18.82	50.86
1-18-82	8.14	18.82	50.86
10-1-82	8.66	19.98	53.94
11-1-82	9.03	21.08	57.23
12-1-82	8.91	20.72	56.15
1-31-83	8.91	20.73	56.19
4-1-83	8.80	20.39	55.16
4-13-83	8.57	19.71	53.13
10-1-83	8.32	18.97	50.90
4-1-84	8.70	20.12	54.36
6-22-84	8.63	19.90	53.70
11-1-84	8.44	19.31	51.92
		Relative Cost per Therm	
8-11-80	67.55 ¢	48.90 ¢	42.67 ¢
10-1-80	72.80	54.17	47.96
12-1-80	73.00	54.33	48.12
4-1-81	72.20	53.50	47.27
10-1-81	78.90	60.27	54.05
10-23-81	81.40	62.73	56.51
1-18-82	81.40	62.73	56.51
10-1-82	86.60	66.60	59.93
11-1-82	90.30	70.25	63.59
12-1-82	89.06	69.07	62.39
1-31-83	89.10	69.10	62.43
4-1-83	88.00	67.97	61.29
4-13-83	85.70	65.70	59.03
10-1-83	83.20	63.23	56.56
4-1-84	87.00	67.07	60.40
6-22-84	86.30	66.33	59.66
11-1-84	84.36	64.37	57.69